

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

**OU\_214162**

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

2/4/62

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 891.2  
S 531 Accession No. S 825

Author Shastri, G.B

Title Introduction to classical Sanskrit -  
1943

This book should be returned on or before the date  
last marked below.

---





# AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL SANSKRIT

AN INTRODUCTORY TREATISE OF THE HISTORY OF  
CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE

BY

GAURINATH BHATTACHARYYA, SHASTRI, M.A.,

Premchand Roychand Student, Lecturer in Sanskrit at the  
Presidency College and at the University of Calcutta.

MODERN BOOK AGENCY

10, College Square, Calcutta.

1943

Published by  
U. C. Bhattacharyya,  
10, College Square, Calcutta.

Printed by A. N. Mukherjee  
M. I. PRESS,  
30, Grey Street, Calcutta.

To the sacred memory of  
my parents.



## PREFACE

The impetus to the writing of the present work came from my students at the Presidency College, Calcutta. The paucity of suitable text-books on the subject intended for Degree and Post-Graduate students of Indian Universities was felt by myself in my college life, and in writing this book I have always borne in mind the difficulties which our students feel in tackling the subject. The work, therefore, does not pretend to be very ambitious.

In the preparation of the book I have freely consulted the two monumental works of M. Winternitz and A. B. Keith. To them, therefore, I am under a deep debt of gratitude. I must also acknowledge my indebtedness to all those authorities whose works have been mentioned in the "References".

In preparing the press copy, my pupil, Professor Sarojendra-nath Bhanja, Sāhityaśāstrī, Kāvya-Purāṇatīrtha, M.A., has rendered invaluable service. Another pupil of mine, Mr. Taraknath Ghosal, M.A., has prepared the major part of the Index. My ex-colleagues, Professor Upendranath Ghosal, M.A., Ph.D., and Professor Subodhchandra Sengupta, M.A., P.R.S., Ph.D., had the kindness, the former, to find out for me a few references, and the latter, to read a considerable portion of the work while in the press. My teachers, Mahāmahopādhyāya Haranchandra Shastri, Professor Sadananda Bhaduri, M.A., Ph.D., and Professor Somnath Maitra, M.A., have helped me much by offering valuable suggestions from time to time. I must also acknowledge the advice given so freely by my friend and colleague, Professor Taraknath Sen, M.A. Lastly, I must mention the deep interest which was taken by my cousin, Pandit Ashokanath Shastri, Vedāntatīrtha, M.A., P.R.S., in seeing the work through.

The occasion makes me remember, with deep and reverent

gratitude, those of my teachers at whose feet I had the privilege of studying the subject—the late Professor Rakhal Das Banerjee, M.A., of the Benares Hindu University, and Professor Nilmony Chakravarty, M.A., late Senior Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency College, Calcutta.

I am thankful to my publishers, the Modern Book Agency, Calcutta, and to the authorities of the M. I. Press, Calcutta, for the kind interest they have taken in the printing and publication of my book.

Calcutta,

January, 1943.

**Author**

---

# ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
<b>Introductory</b> ... ..	1—22
Origin of Indian writing—Vedic and Classical Indian languages : their relationship—Prākṛit —Was Sanskrit a spoken language ?	
<b>Chapter One :</b> The Great Epics ... ..	23—37
Rāmāyaṇa : Origin and story—Character—Spurious element—Antiquity—Relation to Buddhism— Greek influence—Allegorical interpretation— Mythological interpretation.	
Mahābhārata : General character and story—Gītā— Three stages—Age—Literary and inscrip- tional evidence—Which of the two Epics is earlier ?	
<b>Chapter Two :</b> The Purāṇas ... ..	38—43
Introduction—Age and antiquity—Character and value—Name and number of Purāṇas— Devīmāhātmya—Name and number of Upapurāṇas.	
<b>Chapter Three :</b> The Tantras .. ...	44—47
Meaning, contents and classification—Relation to Vedic literature—Antiquity—Home—Works.	
<b>Chapter Four :</b> Kāvya in inscriptions ...	48—50
Renaissance Theory of Max Muller—Girnār and Nāsik inscriptions—Conclusions.	
<b>Chapter Five :</b> Early Buddhist works in Sanskrit ...	51—74
Introduction—Works belonging to Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna schools : (i) Poetical ; (ii) Philoso- phical ; (iii) Avadāna.	

<b>Chapter Six :</b>	Court-epics	...	...	75—87
	Introduction—Growth and development of court-epics—Lesser epic poems			
<b>Chapter Seven :</b>	Drama	...	...	88—118
	Origin of Sanskrit drama—Characteristics—Classification—Growth and development—Less important dramas.			
<b>Chapter Eight :</b>	Lyric Poetry	...	...	119—128
	Introduction - Growth and development—Lesser lyric poems and anthologies.			
<b>Chapter Nine</b>	Historical writings	..	...	129—133
	Introduction—Growth and development—Minor historical works.			
<b>Chapter Ten .</b>	Prose Literature	...	...	134—145
	Introduction—Romance—Fable—Lesser prose tales.			
<b>Chapter Eleven :</b>	Campū literature	..	...	146—147
	Introduction—Some important Campūs.			
<b>Chapter Twelve :</b>	Grammar	.	...	148—159
	Introduction—Pāṇini school—Other important schools—Sectarian schools—Some important grammatical works.			
<b>Chapter Thirteen :</b>	Poetics and Dramaturgy	...	...	160—170
	Introduction—Alaṅkāra school—Rīti school—Rasa School—Dhvani School—Works on Poetics and Dramaturgy.			
<b>Chapter Fourteen :</b>	Metrics		...	171—172
	Introduction—Works on Metrics.			
<b>Chapter Fifteen :</b>	Lexicography	...	...	173—174
	Introduction—Major lexicon—Minor lexicons.			
<b>Chapter Sixteen :</b>	Civil and Religious Law		...	175—179
	Growth and development—Important legal works.			



	PAGES
<b>Chapter Seventeen : Politics</b> ...	180—181
Introduction—Works on Politics	
<b>Chapter Eighteen : Erotics</b> ..	182—183
Introduction—Works on Erotics	
<b>Chapter Nineteen : Medicine</b> ... ..	184—186
History of medical literature—Earlier and later medical works	
<b>Chapter Twenty . Astronomy, Mathematics and     Astrology</b> ...	187—191
History of Astronomy—Works on Astronomy— Works on Mathematics—Works on Astrology.	
<b>Chapter Twenty-One : Miscellaneous Sciences</b> ...	192—194
Archery—Sciences of elephants and horses— Sciences of jewels, stealing, cooking, music, dancing and painting.	
<b>Chapter Twenty-Two : Philosophy</b> ... ..	195—237
Orthodox systems : Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta—Heterodox , systems : Buddhism, Jainism and Materia- lism—Miscellaneous works on philosophy.	
<b>Appendix : History of the Study of Sanskrit in the     West</b> .. ...	i—iv

---

## ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.	KL	<i>Kāvyaḷaṅkāra.</i>
		KS	<i>Kūmasūtra.</i>
<i>Aṣṭ</i>	<i>Aṣṭādhyāyī.</i>	MB	<i>Mahābhāṣya.</i>
<i>Har</i>	<i>Harṣacarita.</i>	Mbh	<i>Mahābhārata.</i>
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series	Nir	<i>Nirukta.</i>
IA	Indian Antiquary	Rag	<i>Raghuvamśa.</i>
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.	Rām	<i>Rāmāyaṇa.</i>
<i>Kūd</i>	<i>Kūdambārī</i> (M.R. Kale. 2nd edition).	RV	<i>R̥gveda.</i>
		SBE	Sacred Books of the East, Oxford.
		SD	<i>Sūhityadarpāṇa.</i>
		SV	<i>Śisūpālavadha.</i>
		Vās	<i>Vāsavadattā.</i>

---

## ERRATA

Pp. 119 &c.	Line 1	For 'Chapter Six' read 'Chapter Eight' and emend all subsequent chapter numberings accordingly.
P. 193	Line 13	For 'Sanmukhakaḷpa' read 'Ṣaṇmukhakaḷpa'.

# AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL SANSKRIT

## INTRODUCTORY

### A

#### ORIGIN OF INDIAN WRITING

The immemorial practice with students of Sanskrit literature has been to commit to memory the various subjects of their study, and this practice of oral tradition has preserved the ancient Vedic texts. This fact has led scholars to surmise that writing was perchance unknown in the earliest period of Indian civilization and that the later forms of the alphabet were not of pure Indian growth.

**Introduc-  
tion**

The earliest references to writing in Sanskrit literature are to be found in the *Dharmasūtra* of Vaśiṣṭha, which, as Dr. Bühler thinks, was composed about the eighth century B.C. There are, however, some scholars who would like to assign a much later date to the work, viz., the fourth century B.C. There we obtain clear evidence of the widely spread use of writing during the Vedic

**Evidence of  
Vedic and  
Sūtra  
works**

period, and in Ch. XVI. 10, 14-15, mention is made of written documents as legal evidence. Further, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini contains such compounds as 'lipikara' and 'libikara' which evidently mean 'writer' [III. ii. 21]. The date of Pāṇini, however, is not fixed. Professor Goldstücker wants to place him in the eighth century B.C., while the general body of scholars holds that his age is the fourth century B.C. In addition to the few references set forth above, it may be said that the later Vedic works contain some technical terms such as 'akṣara,' 'kāṇḍa,' 'paṭala,' 'grantha' and the like, which some scholars quote as evidence of the use of writing. But there are others who like to differ in their interpretations of these terms.

**Evidence of  
Brāhma-  
ṇical works**

The aforesaid references do not help us much in determining the genuine Indian growth of writing, inasmuch as none of the works in which they are found can be safely dated earlier than the period of inscriptions. In the same way, evidences in the Brāhmaṇical works such as the Epics, the Purāṇas, the Kāvya and the like, are of little or no help. Among them, the Epics are by far the oldest, but it is difficult to prove that every word of their text goes back to a high anti-

quity. One fact is, however, undeniable, viz. that the Epics contain some archaic expressions, such as, 'likh,' 'lekha,' 'lekhaka,' 'lekhana,' but not 'lipi,' which, as many scholars think, is after all a foreign word. This may suggest that writing was known in India in the Epic age.

There are two other facts which also suggest the same thing. It is believed that the Aryans were in an advanced state of civilization—there was a high development of trade and monetary transactions, and that they carried on minute researches in grammar, phonetics and lexicography. Do not the above facts presuppose the knowledge of the art of writing among the ancient Indians? Nevertheless, one will have to adduce positive evidence, without which nothing can be taken for granted. So we turn to the Buddhist works.

**Evidence of  
Indian civi-  
lization**

There are quite a large number of passages in the Ceylonese *Tipiṭaka*, which bear witness to an acquaintance with writing and to its extensive use at the time when the Buddhist canon was composed. 'Lekha' and 'lekhaka' are mentioned in the *Bhikkhu Pācittiya* 2, ii and in the *Bhikkhunī Pācittiya* 49, ii. In the former, writing has been highly

**Evidence of  
Buddhist  
writings**

praised. In the Jātakas, constant mention is made of letters. The Jātakas know of proclamations. We are also told of a game named *akṣarikā* in which the Buddhist monk is forbidden to participate. This game was in all probability one of guessing at letters. In the rules of Vinaya, it has been laid down that a criminal, whose name has been written up in the King's porch, must not be received into the monastic order. In the same work, writing has been mentioned as a lucrative profession. Jātaka No. 125 and the *Mahāvagga*, I. 49 bear witness to the existence of elementary schools where the manner of teaching was the same as in the indigenous schools of modern India. All these references prove the existence of the art of writing in pre-Buddhist days.

**Piprāwā  
vase  
inscription**

The earliest written record is the Piprāwā vase inscription which was discovered some-time ago by Colonel Claxton Peppe. This inscription is written in Brāhmī character and is in a language which does not conform to any of the standard Prākritis. Some of the case-endings tend towards Māgadhī. No compound consonant has been written. They have been either simplified or divided

by epenthesis. No long vowel, excepting two 'e' s, have been used. The inscription has been differently interpreted. According to some scholars, the relics that were enshrined were the relics of Buddha, while others maintain that the relics were those of the Śākya, who were massacred by Virulaka, son of Prasenajit, King of Kosala. In any case the inscription belongs to the early part of the fifth century B.C.

Next in order of antiquity comes the Sohgaura copper-plate which, as Dr. Smith thinks, may be dated about half a century prior to Aśoka.<sup>1</sup> The characters of the document according to Dr. Smith are those of the Brāhmī of the Maurya period and his statements, according to Dr. Bühler, are incontestable as everyone of them is traceable in the Edicts. About the proper import

**Sohgaura  
Copper  
plate**

<sup>1</sup>The English translation of Dr. Bühler's version is given below :

'The order of the great officials of Śrāvastī (issued from (their camp at) Mānavasitikāṭa—"These two store-houses with three partitions (which are situated even in famous Vaiṣṇagrāma require the storage of loads (bhāraka) of Black Panicum, parched grain, cummin-seed and Amba for (times of) urgent (need). One should not take (anything from the grain stored)."' — IA. Vol. XXV, pp. 261—66.

of the inscription none is sure. Dr. Smith says that he cannot find out any meaning from it. The value of the inscription rests on the fact that it is an evidence for the assumption that in the third century B.C., the use of writing was common in royal offices and that the knowledge of written characters was widely spread among the people.

**Inscriptions  
of Aśoka,  
Nahapāna  
and Rudra-  
dāman**

The inscriptions of Aśoka, are found almost all over India and are written in two different scripts, viz., Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī. Two of these inscriptions—that of Shāhbāzgarhī and Mānsehrā, are written in the latter. The rest are written in Brāhmī. The language of early Indian inscriptions is not Sanskrit, but vernacular, which is known as Prākṛit. In the inscriptions of Aśoka, local varieties are to be found. Those in the north-western part of India incline more towards Paiśācī, than those found in the eastern part. It is interesting to note that all the Indian inscriptions from the earliest times down to the second century A.D., are in Prākṛit. The earliest inscription in Sanskrit is the Nāsik Cave No. X inscription of Nahapāna, which was written, in all probability, in the year 41 of the Śaka era, corresponding to 119 A.D. But there



are scholars who do not like to call this inscription the earliest in Sanskrit, and in their opinion the well-known Junāgaḍh inscription of Rudradāman, dated 150 A.D., heads the list of Sanskrit inscriptions. Sanskrit gradually encroached upon Prākṛit in the field of epigraphy and it was from the fifth century A.D., that Prākṛit disappeared from the field of inscription.

As for the history of the two scripts, Brāhmi and Kharoṣṭhī, mentioned above, Dr. Bühler thinks that the latter was derived from the Aramaic or Phœnician character used by the clerks of the Persian Empire. The north-western parts of India came under the Achæmenian or Persian rule about the sixth century B.C. And it is in those parts of India that inscriptions and coins in Kharoṣṭhī character have been discovered. Dr. Bühler has taken sufficient pains to show how from some borrowed letters the full alphabet of the Sanskrit language came into being. There are some scholars who have gone so far as to suggest a meaning of the word Kharoṣṭhī. Thus it is held that the name Kharoṣṭhī has been derived from the shape of letters which generally resemble the lip of an ass. Professor Lévi

**Kharoṣṭhī**

thinks that the word is derived from the name of the inventor, Kharoṣṭha, an inhabitant of Central Asia.

**Brāhmī :  
South and  
North  
Semitic  
origin**

There are several theories regarding the origin of the Brāhmī character. According to Dr. Taylor and others, the Brāhmī character was borrowed from a Southern Arab tribe. This theory has not gained any popularity. The theory started by Dr. Weber and illustrated by Dr. Buhler is generally accepted. Dr. Weber was the first man to discover that some of the old Indian letters are practically identical with certain Assyrian letters and several letters in some inscriptions of the ninth and the seventh centuries B.C., found in Assyria. About one-third of the *twenty-three* letters of the North Semitic alphabet of that period is identical with the oldest forms of the corresponding Indian letters. Another one-third is somewhat similar, while the rest can with great difficulty be said to correspond to letters of the Indian alphabet. Dr. Bühler took advantage of this theory of Dr. Weber, and he next proceeded to show that as a result of the prolonged contact between Indian merchants, mostly, Dravidans, and Babylonians in the eighth and the seventh centuries B.C.,

the former availed themselves of the opportunity to bring the Assyrian art of writing over to India, which later on was enlarged to suit the requirements of the Indian people. Nearly a thousand years later, this form of writing came to be styled as Brāhmī. It has been said that originally the letters were written from right to left, as a single coin has been discovered in a place named Iran, on which the legend runs from right to left. But as the Brāhmaṇas believed the right-hand direction to be sacred, they changed the direction and began to write from left to right.

According to Professor Rhys Davids, the Indian letters were developed neither from the Northern nor from the Southern Semitic alphabet, but from the pre-Semitic form current in the Euphrates valley. But this theory is not accepted on the ground that this supposed pre-Semitic form of writing has yet to be explored.

**Pre-Semitic  
origin**

Sir Alexander Cunningham had wanted to derive each letter from the indigenous hieroglyphic, but his theory was discarded on the ground that no such hieroglyphic could be found in India. But the recent excavations at Mahen-jo-daro and Harappa

**Hierogly-  
phic origin**

have brought to light, an original Indian hieroglyphic, and a further examination of the theory once started by Sir A. Cunningham may be undertaken.

#### REFERENCES

- Buhler, G. : (i) Indian Paleography.  
(ii) The Origin of Brāhmī Alphabet.  
(iii) The origin of the Kharoṣṭhi Alphabet (IA. Vol. XXIV).  
(iv) Indian Studies III.
- Cunningham, A. : The Coins of Ancient India.
- Cust, R. N. : On the origin of the Indian alphabet. JRAS. Vol. XVI (New series).
- Lévi, S. : (i) Indian Writing (IA. Vol. XXXIII).  
(ii) Kharoṣṭra and the Kharoṣṭri writing (IA. Vol. XXXV).
- Mitra, P. : New Light from Pre-historic India (IA. Vol. XLVIII).
- Shamasastri, R. : A theory of the origin of the Devanagari alphabet. (IA. Vol. XXXV).
- Taylor, I. : The Alphabet.
- Thomas, E. : Princep's Essays, Vol. II.

#### B

#### VEDIC AND CLASSICAL INDIAN LANGUAGES—THEIR RELATIONSHIP

**Introduc-  
tion**

Indian tradition knows Sanskrit as the language of the gods, which has been the

dominant language of India for a period covering over four thousand years. Viewed from its rich heritage of literature, its fascinating charm of words, its flexibility of expression in relation to thought, Sanskrit occupies a singular place in the literature of the world.

The Sanskrit language is generally divided into Vedic and Classical. In the Vedic language was written the entire sacred literature of the Aryan Indians. Within this Vedic language several stages may be carefully distinguished, and in course of its transition from the one to the other it gradually grew modern till it ultimately merged in Classical Sanskrit. But when we pass on from the Vedic lyrics to the lyrics of Classical Sanskrit, we seem to enter a 'new world'. Not only are the grammar, vocabulary, metre and style different, but there is also a marked distinction in respect of matter and spirit. Thus the Classical Sanskrit period is marked by a change of religious outlook and social conditions. Vedic literature is almost entirely religious ; but Classical Sanskrit has a 'profane' aspect as well which is not in any way inferior to the religious aspect. The religion in the Epic period has become different from

**Vedic and  
Classical .  
difference  
in matter  
and spirit**

what it was in the Vedic age. The Vedic Nature-worship has been superseded by the cult of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, and it is in the Epic period that we find for the first time the incarnations of Viṣṇu who has come to be looked upon as the Supreme Deity. New gods and goddesses unknown to the Vedas have arisen, and Vedic gods have either been forgotten or reduced to a subordinate position. Indra is, indeed, the only god who still maintains high status as the lord of heaven. Vedic literature in its earlier phase was marked by a spirit of robust optimism ; but Classical Sanskrit literature has a note of pessimism owing probably to the influence of the doctrine of *karman* and transmigration of soul. The naive simplicity of Vedic literature is strikingly absent in Classical Sanskrit where the introduction of the supernatural and the wonderful is full of exaggeration. So kings are described as visiting Indra in heaven and a sage creating a new world by means of his great spiritual powers. The tribal organization of the state has lessened much in importance in the Epic period where we find the rise of many territorial kingdoms.

‘In respect of form also Classical Sanskrit

differs considerably from Vedic. Thus the four Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas are marked with accents (*udātta*, *anudātta* and *svarita*) which only can help us in finding out the meaning of different words. Thus, for instance, the word '*Indraśatru*' with one kind of accent will mean 'Indra as enemy', and the same word with a different kind of accent will imply 'enemy of Indra.' But in Classical Sanskrit literature, accent has no part to play.

**Difference  
in form :**  
(i) accent

Phonetically Vedic and Classical languages are identical, but grammatically they differ. (ii) **grammar** The change in grammar is not generally due to the introduction of new formations or inflections, but to the loss of forms.<sup>1</sup> In respect of mood, the difference between Classical and Vedic Sanskrit is specially very great. In the Vedas the present tense has besides its indicative inflection,

<sup>1</sup> Certain grammatical forms which occur in Vedic language disappear in Classical. Thus in declension a number of forms has been dropped :—(i) the nominative and accusative dual forms of '—a' stems ending in—*ā*, e.g., *narī*, (ii) the nominative plural form of '—a' stems ending in—*āsah*, e.g., *devāsah*, (iii) the instrumental plural form of '—a' stems ending in —*ebhiḥ* e.g., *devebhiḥ*, etc.

a subjunctive (requisition), optative (wish) and an imperative (command). The same three moods are found, though with much less frequency, as belonging to the perfect and they are also made from the aorists (*luṇ*) and the future has no moods. In Classical Sanskrit, the present tense adds to its indicative an optative and an imperative. But the subjunctive (*leṭ*) is lost in Classical Sanskrit.<sup>1</sup> In the Vedic period no less than *fifteen* forms of infinitive were used<sup>2</sup> of which only *one* (*tum*) survives in the Classical period. Vedic Sanskrit differs from Classical Sanskrit in respect of the use of prefixes (*upasargas*). Thus in Classical Sanskrit the *upasarga* must invariably precede the root and should form a part of it. But the use of *upasargas* was unrestricted in Vedic Sanskrit. It was used before the root and after it and was also sometimes separated from the root itself.<sup>3</sup> Compounds of more than two words, which are rare in the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas, are frequent in Classical Sanskrit.

<sup>1</sup> *adya jīvānā, śataim jīvāti śaradaḥ*, etc., as found in the Veda.

<sup>2</sup> *Aṣṭ. III. iv. 9.*

<sup>3</sup> *ā kṛṣṇena rajasā vartamāno*, etc.



The aforesaid changes in respect of forms were mainly due to the efforts of grammarians who exercised considerable influence on the development of the language. The vocabulary also underwent many changes. It was largely extended by derivation, composition and compilation. Many old words that could not be found in Vedic literature came to be added in Classical Sanskrit and many new words were borrowed.

(iii) **Vocabulary**

Vedic language again differs from Classical with regard to the use of metres. Beside the principal seven metres of the Vedas (*gāyatrī*, *uṣṇih*, *anuṣṭubh*, *br̥hatī*, *pañkti*, *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī*), Classical Sanskrit presents a limitless variety of metres.

(iv) **Metre**

### REFERENCES

- Ghate, V. S. : Lectures on the R̥gveda.  
 Kielhorn, F. : A Grammar of Sanskrit Language.  
 Macdonell, A. A. : (i) A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
                               (ii) A Vedic Grammar.  
                               (iii) Vedic Mythology.  
 Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.  
 Whitney, W. D. : A Sanskrit Grammar.  
 Williams, M. : A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language.  
 Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I.
-

## C

## PRĀKRIT

**Antiquity**

The beginnings of the Prākritis go back to a period of great antiquity. Even at the time when Vedic hymns were composed, there existed a popular language which differed from the literary dialect. In the Vedic hymns, there are several words which cannot be phonetically other than Prākrit. Buddha and Mahāvīra preached their doctrines in the sixth century B.C., in the language of the people in order that all might understand them. The language of the Buddhist texts which were collected during the period between 500 B.C. and 400 B.C., was Māgadhi. The extant Buddhist texts of Ceylon, Burma and Siam are in a form of popular language to which the name Pāli has been given. There is difference of opinion amongst scholars regarding the place and origin of Pāli. The only inscription, the language of which is akin to Pāli, is the Hāti-Gumphā inscription of Khāravela, dated the 160th year of the Maurya era.

**Relation of  
Sanskrit  
to Prākrit**

Patañjali says that Sanskrit was a spoken language, but it was confined to the cultured section of the people. The popular dialect

of India was known by the general name of Prākṛit. From the distribution of languages in Sanskrit dramas it appears that the masses while speaking Prākṛit, could understand Sanskrit. It has been said in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* that Prākṛit and Sanskrit are different branches of one and the same language. In the earliest known forms of Prākṛit, there are passages which can be easily translated into Sanskrit by the application of simple phonetic rules.

According to European scholars, Prākṛit, which represents the Middle Indian period of the Indo-Aryan languages, may again be sub-divided into three stages : (1) Old Prākṛit or Pāli, (2) Middle Prākṛit, and (3) late Prākṛit or Apabhraṃśa. They would like to say that if Prākṛit had been a language derived from Sanskrit, Prākṛit would have taken the name Sāṃskṛta. Moreover, there are many words and forms in Prākṛit which cannot be traced in Classical Sanskrit. If, however, by the word Sanskrit is included the language of the Vedas and all dialects of the old Indian period, it will be correct to assume that Prākṛit is derived from Sanskrit. But the word Sanskrit is generally used to refer to the Pāṇini-Patañjali language.

**European  
view**

**Orthodox  
view**

Indian grammarians, however, would say that the name Prākṛit is derived from the word *prakṛti*, which means 'the basic form', viz., Sanskrit. Further, in Prākṛit there are *three* classes of words, e.g., (i) '*tatsama*'—words which are identical in form and meaning in both Sanskrit and Prākṛit, e.g., *dava*, *kamala*, (ii) '*tadbhava*'—words that are derived from Sanskrit by the application of phonetic rules, e.g., *ajjautta* < *āryaputra*, *paricumbia* < *paricumbya*, and (iii) "*deśin*"—words that are of indigenous origin and the history of which cannot be accurately traced, e.g., *chollanti*, *caṅga*. A careful examination of Prākṛit vocabulary reveals the fact that the majority of Prākṛit words belong to the second class ; words belonging to the other classes are comparatively small in number. The derivatives are in most cases the result of phonetic decay.

**Varieties of  
Prākṛi**

The following are the more important literary Prākṛits :—Mahārāṣṭrī, Śaurasenī, Māgadhī are the dramatic Prākṛits, while Ardha-Māgadhī, Jaina-Mahārāṣṭrī, Jaina-Śaurasenī are the Prākṛits of the Jaina canon. The last is the Apanbhraṇśa.

## REFERENCES

- Bhandarkar, R. G. : Wilson Philological Lectures  
(Lecture III).  
Vararuci. : *Prākṛtaprakāśa*.  
Woolner, A. C. : Introduction to Prākṛit.

## D

### WAS SANSKRIT A SPOKEN LANGUAGE ?

A section of European scholars would believe that in spite of the vast extent of Sanskrit literature, Sanskrit was never used in actual speech. It was a purely literary and artificial language and the language that was spoken even in ancient times was Prākṛit.

**European  
view**

But there are evidences to show that to all intents and purposes, Sanskrit was a living language and that it was spoken by at least a large section of the people. Etymologists and grammarians like Yāska and Pāṇini describe Classical Sanskrit as *Bhāṣā*—the speech, as distinguished from Vedic Sanskrit,<sup>1</sup> and it will not probably be incorrect to suggest that this description serves to draw out the

**Orthodox  
view**

<sup>1</sup> *Nir.* I. iv. 5 & 7, II. ii. 6 & 7, *Aṣṭ.* III. ii. 108, etc.

special character of Classical Sanskrit as a living speech. Moreover, there are many sūtras in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini which are meaningless unless they have any reference to a living speech.<sup>1</sup> Yāska, Pāṇini and even Kātyāyana have discussed the peculiarities in the usages of Easterners and Northerners.<sup>2</sup> Local variations are also noticed by Kātyāyana, while Patañjali has collected words occurring in particular districts.<sup>3</sup> Patañjali again tells us that the words of Sanskrit are of ordinary life and describes an anecdote in which a grammarian converses with a charioteer and the discussion is carried on in Sanskrit.<sup>4</sup>

**Extent of  
Sanskrit as  
a spoken  
language**

From all that has been said above, it is clear that Sanskrit was a living speech in ancient India. But the question which still remains to be discussed is whether Sanskrit was the vernacular of all classes of people in the society or of any particular section or sections. Patañjali says that ~~the~~

<sup>1</sup> *Aṣṭ.* VIII. iv. 48, etc. Also *Gaṇasūtras*, Nos. 18, 20, 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Nir.* II. ii. 8. *Aṣṭ.* IV. i. 157 & 160.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Vārttika*, "sarve deśāntare" referred to in the *Paspaśāhnika*, *MB*.

<sup>4</sup> *MB.* under *Aṣṭ.* II. iv. 56.

the language spoken in the days of Pāṇini could be mastered if it was heard from the learned Brāhmaṇas of the day (*śiṣṭa*) who could speak correct Sanskrit without any special tuition.<sup>1</sup> It is gathered from the *Sundarakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* that the language spoken by the twice-born castes was Sanskrit.<sup>2</sup> It is stated in the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana that men of taste should speak both in Sanskrit and the vernacular of the province, and this means that Sanskrit was not the spoken language of each and every section of the people in the society.<sup>3</sup> Hiuen Tsang, the Chinese traveller (seventh century A.D.), tells us that the language in which official debates were arranged, was Sanskrit and not any provincial dialect. The *Pañcatantra* informs us that the medium of instruction for the young boys of the ruling class was Sanskrit and not any vernacular.

We may draw from this the conclusion that Sanskrit was the vernacular of the educated people but it was understood in still wider sections. Our conclusions may find support from the evidence of the dramatic literature where we observe

**Conclu-  
sions**

<sup>1</sup> *MB.* under *Aṣṭ.* VI. iii. 109.    <sup>2</sup> *Rām.* V. xxx. 18.

<sup>3</sup> *KS.* iv. 20.

that Brāhmaṇas, kings and ministers speak Sanskrit while women and all the common people use Prākṛit, except that nuns and courtesans occasionally converse in Sanskrit. Uneducated Brāhmaṇas are introduced speaking popular dialects. But it is highly significant that the dialogues between Sanskrit-speaking and Prākṛit-speaking persons are very frequent and this suggests that in real life Sanskrit was understood by those who would not speak it themselves. This statement may be further corroborated by the fact that common people would gather to hear the recital of the popular Epics in the palaces of kings and in temples ; they would not attend such functions unless they could understand the content of the recital.

#### REFERENCES

- Bhandarkar, R. G. : Wilson Philological Lectures  
(Lecture VII).
- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.
- Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.
- Pathak, K. B. : The Age of Pāṇini and Sanskrit  
as a spoken language (ABORI.  
Vol. XI).
- Rapson, E. J. : JRAS. 1904.
-



# CHAPTER ONE

## THE GREAT EPICS

### A RĀMĀYAṆA

The Indian tradition makes Vālmīki, the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the first poet (*ādikavi*) who is reported to have been deeply moved by the piteous wailings of the female curlew when her husband was killed by the dart of a forester. Vālmīki's feelings found an expression through the medium of metre,<sup>1</sup> and at the bidding of the divine sage Nārada who brought messages from Brahmā he composed the immortal Rāma-Epic which tells the story of Prince Rāma, the dutiful and devoted son of King Daśaratha of Ayodhyā, who was banished from his kingdom for fourteen years through the jealousy of his step-mother Kaikeyī who secured possession of the throne for her son Bharata. So Rāma and Sītā, his beloved wife, accompanied by the third prince Lakṣmaṇa went to the forest. There the adventures of the banished prince, Sītā's abduction by Rāvaṇa, King of Laṅkā, the help given to Rāma

Origin  
and story

<sup>1</sup> *Rām.* I. ii. 15. Also, cf. *Rag.* XIV. 70.

by Hanumat, a chief of the monkeys, the destruction of Rāvaṇa and his party, the fire-ordeal of Sitā to prove her chastity—these and many other incidents have been described in all the glowing colours of poetry.

**Character**

The *Rāmāyaṇa* which is essentially a poetic creation has influenced the thought and poetry of later centuries in course of which new matters were added to the original composition. The work, in its present form and extent, comprises *seven* books and contains 24000 verses approximately. But it must be remembered that the text of the Epic has been preserved in *three* recensions, the West Indian, the Bengal and the Bombay, and curiously enough each recension has almost one third of the verses occurring in neither of the other two. Of the *three*, the Bombay recension is believed to have preserved the oldest form of the Epic, for here we find a large number of archaic expressions which are rare in the Bengal and the West Indian recensions. According to Professor Jacobi, the Rāma-Epic was first composed in the Kośala country on the basis of the ballad poetry recited by the rhapsodists. In course of time there naturally arose differ-

ence in the tradition of the recitations made by professional story-tellers, and this difference adequately explains the variations in the *three* recensions when they had been assuming their definite forms in the different parts of the land.

Internal evidence proves almost conclusively that the whole of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as it is found to-day was not written at one time. It is said that of the *seven* books in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the last one and portions of the first are interpolations. In the first place, there are numerous passages in the genuine books which either make no reference to the incidents in the first book or contain statements which contradict those to be found in the first book. Secondly, in the first and third cantos of the first book we find two tables of contents, the first of which does not mention the first and the seventh books. Thirdly, the style and language of the first book do not bear comparison with that of the five genuine books (II—VI). Fourthly, the frequent interruption of the narrative in the first and the seventh books and the complete absence of any such interruption in the other five books cannot but suggest that the two books were

**Spurious  
element**

composed by subsequent poets of less eminence and talent than the author of the genuine books. Lastly, the character of the hero as drawn in the first and the seventh books differs from what we find in the remaining books. Thus in those two books Rāma is not a mortal hero which he is in the other five books, but a divine being worthy of reverence to the nation.

#### Antiquity

It has been already observed that the original work of Vālmīki assumed different forms as with years rhapsodists introduced into it newer elements. It is, therefore, very difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to fix any specified age for the whole poem. Dr. Winternitz says that the transformation of Rāma from a man to the Universal God through a semi-divine national hero, cannot but take a sufficient length of time. It should be noted, however, that not only the Rāma-legend but the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki also was known to the *Mahābhārata* which contains the *Rāmopākhyāna* in the *Vana-parvan*, of course, in a condensed form. On the other hand, the poet or the poets of the *Rāmāyaṇa* nowhere refer to the Bhāratan story. These facts have led scholars like Professor Jacobi to presume a very early

existence of the Rāma-Epic<sup>1</sup> though it still remains a disputed point whether it was earlier than the original story of the *Mahābhārata*, the passage in the *Vanaparvan* containing the reference to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, being absent in that very early form of the Bhāratan Epic. Dr. Winternitz believes that "if the *Mahābhārata* had on the whole its present form in the 4th Century A. D., the *Rāmāyaṇa* must have received its final form at least a century or two earlier."

From a study of Jātaka literature it would appear that the stories of some of the Jātakas naturally remind us of the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* though it must be admitted that we seldom observe any 'literal agreement' between the two. To cite an instance, the *Daśaratha-jātaka* relates the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in a different way, where Rāma and Sītā are described as brother and sister. But it is highly significant that while the Jātakas give us innumerable stories of the demon-world and the animals,

Relation to  
Buddhism

<sup>1</sup> Scholars like Jacobi, Schlegel, M. Williams, Jolly and others point out that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is earlier than the *Mahābhārata*, because the burning of widows does not occur in it, but it is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*.

they never mention the names of Rāvaṇa and Hanumat and the monkeys. It is not, therefore, improbable that prior to the fourth or the third centuries B.C., when the Buddhist *Tipiṭaka* is believed to have come into existence, the *Rāmāyaṇa* in its Epic form was not available though ballads dealing with Rāma were known to exist. Traces of Buddhism cannot be found in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the solitary instance where the Buddha is mentioned is believed to be an interpolation.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Weber, however, suggests that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is based on an ancient Buddhist legend of Prince Rāma. He thinks that the hero of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is essentially a sage in spirit and not merely a hero of war and that in Rāma we observe the glorification of the ideal of Buddhist equanimity. Dr. Winternitz also approves of the idea of explaining the extreme mildness and gentleness of Rāma by 'Buddhistic undercurrents.' But we must say that by thinking in this way Dr. Weber has ignored the fact that a poet like Vālmiki could easily draw his inspiration from his own heritage. Our con-

<sup>1</sup> Lassen on Weber's *Rāmāyaṇa* (IA. Vol. III).

clusion, therefore, is that there was no direct influence of Buddhism on the *Rāmāyaṇa*.—

It is certain that there is no Greek influence on the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the genuine *Rāmāyaṇa* betrays no acquaintance with the Greeks. Dr. Weber, however, thinks that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is based on the Greek legend of Helen and the Trojan war. But an examination of the contents of the *Rāmāyaṇa* shows that the expression *yavana* occurs twice in the passages of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which are evidently interpolations.

**Greek  
influence**

Professor Lassen was the first scholar to give an allegorical interpretation of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In his opinion the Epic represented the first attempt of the Aryans to conquer Southern India. According to Dr. Weber it was meant to account for the spread of Aryan civilization to South India and Ceylon.

**Allegorical  
interpreta-  
tion of the  
Epic**

Professor Jacobi gives us a mythological interpretation and says that there is no allegory in the Epic. Thus he points out that in the *R̥gveda*, *Sītā* appears as the field-furrow and invoked as the goddess of agriculture. In some of the *Gr̥hyasūtras* *Sītā* is the genuine daughter of the plough-field and is a wife of *Parjanya* or *Indra*. In

**Mythologi-  
cal interpre-  
tation**

the *Rāmāyaṇa* also Sītā is represented as emerging from the plough-field of Janaka. Rāma can be identified with Indra and Hanumat with the Maruts, the associates of Indra in his battle with demons. But we would only add that to read allegory or mythology in a first rate work of art is without any justification.

## REFERENCES

- Davids, R. : Buddhist India.  
Hopkins, E. W. : The Great Epics of India.  
Jacobi, H. : Das Rāmāyaṇa.  
Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
Smith, V. A. : Oxford History of India.  
Weber, A. : (i) On the Rāmāyaṇa. (IA. Vol. III).  
(ii) The History of Indian Literature.  
Williams, M. : Indian Wisdom.  
Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature,  
Vol. I.



## B

### MAHĀBHĀRATA

Dr. Winternitz describes the *Mahābhārata* as a whole literature and does not look upon it as one poetic production which the *Rāmāyaṇa* essentially is. The nucleus of the *Mahābhārata* is the great war of eighteen days fought between the Kauravas, the hundred sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and the Pāṇḍavas, the five sons of Pāṇḍu. The poet narrates all the circumstances leading up to the war. In this great Kurukṣetra battle were involved almost all the kings of India joining either of the two parties. The result of this war was the total annihilation of the Kauravas and their party, and Yudhiṣṭhira, the head of the Pāṇḍavas, became the sovereign monarch of Hastināpura. But with the progress of years new matters and episodes, relating to the various aspects of human life, social, economic, political, moral and religious as also fragments of other heroic legends and legends containing reference to famous kings, came to be added to the aforesaid nucleus and this phenomenon probably continued for centuries till in the early part of the Christian era the Epic gathered its present shape which is said

**General  
character  
and story**

to contain a hundred thousand verses. It is, therefore, that the *Mahābhārata* has been described not only as a heroic poem, but also as a 'repertory of the whole of the bard poetry'. The Epic in its present form is divided into *eighteen* books with a supplement called the *Harivaṃśa*.<sup>1</sup>

**Gītā**

The famous *Śrīmad-Bhagavadgītā* is a chapter of the *Bhīṣmaparvan* and contains *eighteen* sections. The *Gītā* is a simplification in verse of the crude doctrines in Hindu philosophy and is a book specially meant for the dwellers of the society rather than for one who has renounced it. The book is no doubt one of the finest fruits of Indian philosophy and has gained world-wide recognition in the hands of philosophers. The theme of this book is the advice, given by Śrī-Kṛṣṇa for consoling depressed Arjuna, mainly dwelling on the doctrines of *karman*, *jñāna* and *bhakti*.

**Three  
stages of  
the Epic**

It is extremely difficult for us to separate at this distant date the chaff from the real. However, in the first book of the *Mahābhārata* there is a statement that at one time

<sup>1</sup> It is not definitely known whether this division into eighteen books is purely traditional, there being a somewhat different form of division as surmised from the writings of Albēruṇī.

the Epic contained 24000 verses while in another context we find that it consisted of 8800 verses. These statements may definitely lead one to conclude that the Epic had undergone *three* principal stages of development before it assumed its present form.

It is impossible to give in one line the exact date of the *Mahābhārata*. To determine the date of the *Mahābhārata* we should determine the date of every part of this Epic. In the Vedas there is no mention of the incident of the great Kurukṣetra battle. In the Brāhmaṇas, however, the holy Kuru-field is described as a place of pilgrimage where gods and mortals celebrated big sacrificial feasts. We also find the names of Janamejaya and Bharata in the Brāhmaṇas. So also the name of Parikṣit as a ruler of Kuru-land is found in the *Atharvaveda*. We find frequent mention of the Kurus and the Pāṇcālas in the *Yajurveda*. The *Kāthaka-saṃhitā* mentions the name of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, son of Vicitravīrya. In the *Sāṅkhyāyana-śrautasūtra* we find the mention of a war in Kuru-land which was fatal for the Kauravas. But the names of the Pāṇḍavas do not occur therein. The *Gr̥hyasūtra* of Āśvalāyana gives the names of *Bhārata* and

Age of the  
Epic

*Mahābhārata* in a list of teachers and books. Pāṇini gives us the derivation of the words Yudhiṣṭhira, Bhīma and Vidura and the accent of the compound *Mahābhārata*. Patañjali is the first to make definite allusions to the story of the battle between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas. Although the Buddhist *Tipiṭaka* does not mention the name of the *Mahābhārata*, the Jātakas betray a slight acquaintance with it.

**Literary  
and inscrip-  
tional  
evidence**

Moreover, it is proved by literary and inscriptional evidence that already about 500 A.D., the *Mahābhārata* was no longer an actual Epic but a sacred book and a religious discourse. It was on the whole essentially different from the Epic as it is found to-day. Kumārilabhaṭṭa quotes passages from the *Mahābhārata* and regards it as a Smṛti work. Both Subandhu and Bāṇa knew it as a great work of art<sup>1</sup> and Bāṇa alludes to a recital of the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>2</sup> It must be admitted on all hands that though an Epic *Mahābhārata* did not exist in the time of the Vedas, single myths, legends and poems included in the *Mahābhārata* reach back to the Vedic period. The *Mahābhārata* has also

<sup>1</sup> *Vās.* p. 37 & *Har.* p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Kād.* p. 104.

drawn many moral narratives and stories of saints from its contemporary 'ascetic-poetry'. An Epic *Mahābhārata*, however, did not exist in the fourth century B.C., and the transformation of the Epic *Mahābhārata* into our present compilation probably took place between the fourth century B.C. and the fourth century A.D. In the fourth century A.D., the work was available in its present extent, contents and character, though small alterations and additions might have continued even in later centuries.

To the strictly orthodox Indian mind, the *Rāmāyaṇa* appears to have been composed earlier than the *Mahābhārata*. Indians believe that of the two incarnations of the Lord, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, the former was born earlier. Western critics do not attach any importance to this belief, for it is argued by them that the hero of the genuine portion of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which is older, does not appear as an incarnation but as an ordinary mortal hero.<sup>1</sup> Professor Jacobi

**Two Epics  
which is  
earlier ?**

<sup>1</sup> There are a few passages in the genuine books, e.g., the one in Bk. VI. where Sitā enters into the pyre, wherein Rāma is described as a divine being. Critics feel no hesitation in calling such passages interpolations.

also thinks that of the two poems, the *Rāmāyaṇa* is the earlier production, and he bases his theory on the supposition that it is the influence of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which has moulded the *Mahābhārata* into a poetic form.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Winternitz does not attach any real importance to this theory and criticizes it by saying that the *Mahābhārata*, even in its present form, retains several characteristics of older poetry while the poem of Vālmīki reveals such peculiarities as would place him nearer to the age of Court-epics. Thus it has been pointed out that such expressions like “Bhīṣma spake” “Sañjaya spake” which the poet of the *Mahābhārata*, uses to introduce a character, are reminiscent of ancient ballad poetry.<sup>2</sup> But in the *Rāmāyaṇa* the speeches are introduced in verses and therefore in a more polished form. The theory of Professor Jacobi may be further contested on the ground that

<sup>1</sup> According to Mr. Hopkins, the *Rāmāyaṇa* as an art-product is later than the *Mahābhārata*. (Cf. Cambridge History, I. p. 251.)

<sup>2</sup> The mixture of prose with poetry which we notice in the *Mahābhārata* is a fact that proves its antiquity. This view of Professor Oldenberg is not accepted by Dr Winternitz.

from a perusal of the two Epics, the reader will unmistakably carry the impression that while the *Mahābhārata* describes a more war-like age, the *Rāmāyaṇa* depicts a comparatively refined civilization.

### REFERENCES

- Bhandarkar, R. G. : On the Mahābhārata (IA. Vol. I).  
 Goldstucker, T. : The Mahābhārata.  
 Hopkins, E. W. : The Great Epics of India.  
 Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
 Telang, K. T. : SBE. Vol. VIII.  
 Vaidya, C. V. : Mahābhārata, a critical study.  
 Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.  
 Williams, M. : Indian Wisdom.  
 Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I.
-

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE PURĀṆAS

**Introduc-  
tion**

The origin of the Purāṇas must be traced to that time of religious revolution when Buddhism was gaining ground as a formidable foe of Brāhmaṇic culture. Great devotees of Brāhmaṇic religion were anxious for the preservation of the old relics of Hindu culture, and Vyāsa, the great compiler, the greatest man of his time, was born to meet the demand of the age. The most important point to be remembered in this connection, is that the entire Vedic culture lies at the back-ground of the age of Buddhism and the Purāṇas.

**Age**

It was at one time believed by European scholars that not one of the *eighteen* Purāṇas is earlier than the eleventh century A.D. But this belief has been discarded on the discovery of a manuscript of the *Skandapurāṇa* in Nepal written in the sixth century A.D. Further, Bāṇabhaṭṭa in his *Harṣacarita* mentions that he once attended a recitation of the *Vāyupurāṇa*. Kumārila (750 A.D.) regards the Purāṇas as the sources of law. Śaṅkara (ninth century A.D.) and Rāmānuja (eleventh century A.D.) refer to the Purāṇas



as sacred texts for their dependence on the Vedas. The famous traveller Albĕrūnī (1030 A.D.) also gives us a list of the *eighteen* Purāṇas.

(The word Purāṇa means 'old narrative.' In the Brāhmaṇas, the Upaniṣads and the Buddhist texts, the word is found to be used in connection with Itihāsa. Some scholars hold that the Purāṇas mentioned in these places do not refer to the works we have before us. But the references found in the *Dharmasūtras* of Gautama and Āpastamba (works belonging in all probability to the fifth or the fourth century B.C.) suggest that there were at that early period works resembling our Purāṇas. The close relationship between the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas is another point in support of the antiquity of the latter.) The *Mahābhārata* which calls itself a Purāṇa, has the general character of the latter, and it is not highly improbable that some integral parts of the Purāṇas are older than the present redaction of the *Mahābhārata*. The *Lalitavistara* not only calls itself a Purāṇa but has also much in common with the Purāṇas. (The *Vāyupurāṇa* is quoted literally by the *Harivaṃśa*. The genealogical survey of all the Purāṇas reveals

**Antiquity**

the fact that they generally stop with the accounts of the Andhra Bhṛtya and Gupta kings and that later kings like Harṣa are not mentioned. So it may be suggested that the Purāṇas were written during the rule of the Gupta kings. On the other hand, the striking resemblance between the Buddhist Mahāyāna texts of the first century A.D., and the Purāṇas, suggests the fact that the latter were written early in the beginnings of the Christian era. The characteristics of the Purāṇas are also found in books like the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* and the *Mahāvastu*. Dr. Winternitz has, however, concluded that the earlier Purāṇas must have come into being before the seventh century A.D.

#### Character

(According to Indian tradition every Purāṇa should discuss *five* topics ; (i) *sarga*—creation, (ii) *pratisarga*—the periodical annihilation and renewal of the world, (iii) *vaṃśa*—genealogy of gods and sages, (iv) *manvantara*—the Manu-periods of time i.e., the great periods each of which has a Manu (primal ancestor of the human race) as its ruler, and (v) *vaṃśānucarita*—the history of the dynasties the origin of which is traced to the Sun and the Moon. But all these *five* characteristics are not present in

every Purāṇa, and though in some they are partially present, we notice a wide diversity of topics in them. Thus we find many chapters dealing with the duties of the four castes and of the four *āśramas*, sections on Brāhmanical rites, on particular ceremonies and feasts and frequently also chapters on Sāṅkhya and Yoga philosophy. But the most striking peculiarity of all the Purāṇas is their sectarian character as they are dedicated to the cult of some deity who is treated as the principal God in the book. So we come across a Purāṇa dedicated to Viṣṇu, another to Śiva and so on.

Unique is the importance of the Purāṇas from the standpoint of history and religion. The genealogical survey of the Purāṇas is immensely helpful for the study of political history in ancient India, and yet it is a task for the scholar to glean germs of Indian history, hidden in the Purāṇas. Dr. Smith says that the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* gives us invaluable informations about the Maurya dynasty. The *Matsyapurāṇa* is most dependable in so far as the Andhra dynasty is concerned, while the *Vāyupurāṇa* gives us detailed descriptions about the reign of Candragupta I. As the object of the Purāṇas was to popularize

Value

the more difficult and highly philosophical preaching of the Vedas through the medium of historical facts and tales, we naturally find in them Hinduism in a fully developed form. So the student of religion cannot pass it by. The Purāṇas are not also wanting in literary merit, and they abound in numerous passages which speak of the highly artistic talent of their makers.

Name and  
number

(The Purāṇas or the Mahā-purāṇas, as we have them to-day, are *eighteen* in number, and there are also minor Purāṇas (Upa-purāṇas) which all again number *eighteen*. The *eighteen* Mahā-purāṇas are :—

(1) *Brahma*, (2) *Padma*, (3) *Viṣṇu*, (4) *Śiva*, (5) *Bhāgavata*, (6) *Nārada*, (7) *Mārkaṇḍeya*, (8) *Agni*, (9) *Bhaviṣya* or *Bhaviṣyat*, (10) *Brahmavaivarta*, (11) *Līṅga*, (12) *Varāha*, (13) *Skanda*, (14) *Vāmana*, (15) *Kūrma*, (16) *Matsya*, (17) *Garuḍa* and (18) *Brahmāṇḍa*.

Devīmāhāt-  
mya

The *Devīmāhātmya* which is popularly known as the 'Caṇḍī' or the 'Saptaśatī', is a section of the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*. According to Dr. Winternitz, its date is not later than the sixth century A.D. The book which contains *thirteen* chapters and *seven hundred* mantras, is a glorification of the Primal

Energy (*Ādyā Śakti*) who descends amongst all created beings from time to time to rid the worlds of their pestilence and killed in the past the demons Madhu-Kaiṭabha, Mahiṣāśura, Śumbha and Niśumbha among others. The book is recited in many religious functions of the Hindus.

The *eighteen* Upa-purāṇas which have been told by different sages are :—

(1) *Sanatkumara*, (2) *Narasimha*, (3) *Vāyu*, (4) *Śivadharmā*, (5) *Āścarya*, (6) *Nārada*, (7) the two *Nandikeśvaras*, (8) *Uśanas*, (9) *Kapila*, (10) *Varuṇa*, (11) *Śāmba*, (12) *Kālikā*, (13) *Maheśvara*, (14) *Kalki*, (15) *Devī*, (16) *Parāśara*, (17) *Mārīci* and (18) *Bhāskara* or *Sūrya*.<sup>1</sup>

Name &  
number of  
Upa-  
purāṇas

#### REFERENCES

Bhandarkar, R. G. · A peep into the Early History of India (JBRAS. Vol. XX. 1900).

Pargiter, F. E. : ERE. Vol. X. 1918.

Rapson, E. J. : Cambridge History, Vol. I.

Wilson. H. H. : Essays on Sanskrit Literature.

Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I.

<sup>1</sup> The above list of Upa-purāṇas given by Raghunandana is taken from the *Śabdakalpadruma*. Hemādri gives a different list.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE TANTRAS

Meaning,  
contents  
and classification

The expression Tantra which is a generic name for works belonging to 'Āgama', 'Tantra' and 'Sāṃhitā', refers to theological treatises discussing the codes of discipline and worship among different sects of religion along with their metaphysical and mystical points of view. A complete Tantra generally consists of four parts, the themes treated of being (i) knowledge (*jñāna*), (ii) meditation (*yoga*), (iii) action (*kriyā*) and (iv) conduct (*caryā*). Though it is not possible to draw any special line of demarcation among Āgama, Tantra and Sāṃhitā, still it is usual to refer to the sacred books of the Śaivas by the expression Āgama, while Tantra stands for the sacred literature of the Śāktas and Sāṃhitā for that of the Vaiṣṇavas. The Śākta-Tantras are mainly monistic in character, while the Vaiṣṇava-Tantras generally advocate dualism, or qualified monism. The Śaiva-Tantras are divided into three schools of monism, qualified monism and dualism.

The Tantras came to replace the Vedas

when in later times it was found that performance of a sacrifice according to Vedic rites was practically impossible owing to their rigid orthodoxy. Thus the Tantras prescribe easier and less complicated methods which would suit not only the higher classes but also the Śūdras and the feminine folk of the society who had no access to Vedic ceremonies. It would, therefore, not be wise to think that Tantric literature is opposed to Vedic literature, and this point would be made abundantly clear when it is found that the rigidly orthodox Vedic scholars write original works and commentaries on Tantras.

**Relation to  
Vedic  
literature**

The earliest manuscripts of Tantras date from the seventh to the ninth century A.D., and it is probable that the literature dates back to the fifth or the sixth century A.D., if not earlier. We do not find any reference to a Tantra in the *Mahābhārata*. The Chinese pilgrims also do not mention it. It is, indeed, certain that Tantric doctrine penetrated into Buddhism in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. The worship of Durgā may be traced back even to the Vedic period.

**Antiquity**

The home of Āgamic literature seems to be Kāshmir, while that of Tāntric literature is Bengal. Sāṃhitā literature,

**Home**

as it is known, originated in different parts of India, in Bengal, South India and the Siamese country.

**Works on  
Āgama**

Among works belonging to Āgamic literature of Kāshmir the most important are the following :—

*Mālinīvijaya*, *Svacchanda*, *Vijñānabhairava*, *Ucchuṣṣmabhairava*, *Anandabhairava*, *Mrgendra*, *Mataṅga*, *Netra*, *Naiśvāsa*, *Svāyambhuva* and *Rudrayāmala*.

**Works on  
Pratyabhi-  
jñā**

Closely associated with Āgamic literature is Pratyabhijñā literature. Some of the most important works of this literature are :

*Śivadṛṣṭi* of Somānanda (850-900 A.D.) *Pratyabhijñākārikās* of Utpala (900-950 A.D.) *Mālinīvijayottaravārttika*, *Pratyabhijñāvīmarśinī*, *Tantrāloka*, *Tantrasāra* and *Paramārthasāra* of Abhinavagupta (993-1015 A.D.) and *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* of Kṣemarāja (pupil of Abhinavagupta).

**Works on  
Saṁhitā**

Among works belonging to Saṁhitā literature the most important is the *Ahīr-budhnyasaṁhitā* which was composed in Kāshmir in the fifth century A.D. *Īkvara-saṁhitā*, *Pauṣkarasaṁhitā*, *Paramasaṁhitā*, *Sāttvatasāṁhitā*, *Bṛhadbrahmasaṁhitā* and *Jñānāmṛtasārasaṁhitā* are other well-known works of this branch of Sanskrit literature.



Among works belonging to Tantra literature, mention may be made of the following :—

**Works on  
Tantra**

*Mahānirvāṇa*, *Kulārṇava*, *Kulacūḍāmaṇi*, *Prapañcasāra* (of Śaṅkara), *Tantrarāja*, *Kālivilāsa*, *Jñānārṇava*, *Śāradātilaka*, *Varivasyārahasya* (of Bhāskara), *Tantrasāra* (of Kṛṣṇānanda) and *Prāṇatoṣiṇī*.

#### REFERENCES

- Avalon, A. : Tantrik Texts.  
 Chatterji, J. C. : Kashmir Shaivism.  
 Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature,  
 Vol. I.
-

## CHAPTER FOUR

### KĀVYA IN INSCRIPTIONS

#### Renaissance theory

Early in the beginnings of Sanskritic studies in Europe, Professor Max Muller propounded the theory of the 'Renaissance of Sanskrit literature', which remained highly popular for a considerable length of time. This theory, set forth with much profundity, sought to establish that Brāhmaṇic culture passed through its dark age at the time when India was continuously facing foreign invasions. The earliest revival of this culture is to be found in the reign of the Guptas which is a golden page in the annals of Indian culture. In spite of all its ingenuity the theory has been generally discarded by recent researches and discovery. Evidences are now at our disposal to prove the falsity of the assumption and the inscriptions of the early centuries of the Christian era unmistakably show that the study and development of Sanskrit Kāvya was never impeded.

#### Girnār inscription

Thus the inscription of Rudradāman at Girnār dated 150 A.D., is written in prose in the full-fledged Kāvya style with conformity to the rules of grammar.

Though traces of epic licence can be found in the inscription, still the writer is a gifted master in the use of figures of speech. As an example of alliteration may be cited the phrase '*abhyastanāmno Rudradāmno*'. Though there are long compounds still the clearness and the lucidity of the style is nowhere forsaken. What is more significant is that the author is conversant with the science of poetics and discusses the merits attributed by Daṇḍin to the Vaidarbha style.

Still another inscription which is derivable from a record of Siri Puṣumāyi at Nāsik is written in Prākṛit prose. The date of this inscription is not far removed from the former. The author who is undoubtedly familiar with Sanskrit, uses enormous sentences with long compounds. Alliterations and even mannerisms of later Kāvya are found in this inscription.

**Nāsik  
inscription**

It may be, therefore, concluded that the works of Aśvaghoṣa, the great Buddhist poet, are not the earliest specimens of Sanskrit Kāvya. Either these earlier Kāvya are now lost to us unfortunately, or authors like Kālidāsa have completely eclipsed the glory of their predecessors. Thus of the three

**Conclu-  
sions**

dramatists referred to by Kālidāsa, the dramas of only one are now known to us.

#### REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Muller, Max. : A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature.

---

## CHAPTER FIVE

### EARLY BUDDHIST WORKS IN SANSKRIT

The paucity of authentic landmarks in the domain of early Indian history is a stupendous stumbling block to the gateway to the study of the history of Sanskrit literature. A colossal darkness that envelops the period of Sanskrit literature in the beginnings of the Christian era, makes it extremely difficult, if not hopelessly impossible, to ascertain the age in which a particular writer lived and wrote his work. The chronology of Indian literature is shrouded in such painful obscurity that oriental scholars were long ignorant of the vast literature produced in Sanskrit, by Buddhist writers.

**Introduc-  
tion**

The thought of the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism was expressed in a language which was not Pāli, the extraordinarily rich and extensive religious literature of Ceylon and Burma, but which was partly Sanskrit and partly a dialect to which Professor Senart has given the designation Mid-Sanskrit, or which Professor Pischel likes to call the Gāthā

**Buddhist  
Sanskrit  
literature  
includes  
Mahāyāna  
and Hīna-  
yāna works**

dialect.<sup>1</sup> This literature of the Mahāyāna school is called Buddhist Sanskrit literature. But it should be mentioned in this connection that Buddhist Sanskrit literature is not synonymous with the rich literature of the Mahāyāna school alone, but it has a still wider scope including as it does the literature of the Hīnayāna school as well, inasmuch as the Sarvāstivādins, a sect of the Hīnayāna school, possess a canon and a fairly vast literature in Sanskrit. The Sanskrit canon, however, is not available in its entirety, but its existence is proved on the evidence of the several quotations from it in such works as the *Mahāvastu*, the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Lalitavistara*. This Sanskrit canon shows close affinity to the Pāli canon, and it is suggested that both of them are but translations of some original canon in Māgadhī, which is lost to us.

**Mahāvastu :**  
**its date**

The most important work of the Hīnayāna school is the *Mahāvastu*, the book of the Great Events. This *Mahāvastu*, a book belonging to the school of the Loko-

<sup>1</sup>It may be observed in this connection that the Nāsik Cave inscription No. X of Nahapāna is written in this dialect.

ttaravādins, a sub-division of the Mahāsāṅghikas, shows after the introduction, the following title : *Āryamahāsāṅghikānām Lokottaravādinām madhyadeśikānām pāṭhena vinayapīṭakasya mahāvastu ādi*. This may furnish us with a clue to determine the date of its composition. In order to ascertain this it is to be found out when the Lokottaravādin sect of the Mahāsāṅghikas sprang up. In this connexion, it would be necessary to fix the date of Buddha's death. Scholars are divided in their opinions as to the exact year when Buddha died. Professors Max Müller and Cunningham make it 477 B.C., while Mr. Gopala Aiyer likes to fix it at 483 B.C. But more probable is Dr. Smith's theory according to which Buddha died in 487 B.C. It is said that Aśoka was coronated in 269 B.C., and that this coronation took place some two hundred and eighteen years after the death of Buddha. But, if the account of the Southern Buddhists is to be believed, this year was either 544 or 543 B.C. Now the opening lines of the fifth chapter of the *Mahāvamsa* will throw light on the age when the Mahāsāṅghikas came into being.<sup>1</sup> There it is

<sup>1</sup> Eko 'va theravādo so ādivassasate ahu | aññā-

stated that during the first century after the death of Buddha, there was but one schism among the Theras. Subsequent to this period, other schisms took place among the preceptors. From the whole of those sinful priests, in number ten thousand, who had been degraded by the Theras (who had held the second convocation) originated the schism among the preceptors called the Mahāsāṅghika heresy. It is described in this connexion that as many as eighteen schisms rose and all of them in the course of a couple of centuries after the death of Buddha. But, the difficulty is that there is no mention of the Lokottaravādins in the *Mahāvamsa*. In the appendix of the translation of the *Mahāvamsa*, it has been said that the Lokottaravādins do not appear in the tradition of the Southern Buddhists. They are mentioned immediately beside the Gokulikas. In Rock hill 182, the Lokottaravādins are to be found

cariyavādā tu tato oram ajāyisum || Tehi saṅgītikā-  
 rehi therehi dutiyehi te | niggahitā pāpabhikkhū sabbe  
 dasasahassikā || Akāṃs'acāriyavādaṃ Mahāsāṅghika-  
 nāmakam ||



just in the place where the Gokulikas are expected. Moreover, in two other contexts, the Gokulikas and not the Lokottaravādins are mentioned. Thus, it is better to identify the two and in that case, the Lokottaravādins seem to have sprung up at least in the third century B.C. That being so, the *Mahāvastu*, which has been described to be the first work of their sect, could not have been written later than that period.

But a fresh difficulty makes its appearance. The *Mahāvastu* is not a composite whole. Different parts of it have been composed at different periods and this accounts for the unmethodical arrangement of facts and ideas in the work. Besides, the *Mahāvastu* is not a piece of artistic literature. It has rightly been called 'a labyrinth in which we can only with an effort, discover the thread of a coherent account of the life of Buddha.' The contents are not in the least properly arranged and the reader may come across the repetition of the same story, over and over again. But the importance of the work can never be undervalued in view of the fact that it has preserved numerous traditions of respectable antiquity and versions of texts occurring in the Pāli canon.

The *Mahāvastu* has yet another claim to its importance, for in it the reader discovers a storehouse of stories. It is a truth that nearly half of the book is devoted to Jātakas and stories of like nature. Most of the narratives remind us of the stories of Purāṇas and the history of Brahmadatta may be cited as an instance. To conclude, the *Mahāvastu*, though a work of the Hinayāna school, betrays some affinity to the Mahāyānistic thought. The mention of a number of Buddhas and the conception of Buddha's self-begottenness, are ideas associated with the Mahāyāna school.

**Lalitavistara : its character**

The literature of the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism is extremely rich. Though originally a work of the Sarvāstivādin school attached to the Hinayāna, the *Lalitavistara* is believed to be one of the most sacred Mahāyāna texts, inasmuch as it is regarded as a Vaipulyasūtra. That the work contains the Mahāyānistic faith may easily be inferred from the very title of the work which means 'the exhaustive narrative of the sport of the Buddha.' A critical study of the work reveals, however, that it is but a 'redaction of an older Hinayāna text expanded and embellished in the sense of

the Mahāyāna, a biography of the Buddha, representing the Sarvāstivādin school.' It is also a fact that the present *Lalitavistara* is not the work of a single author ; it is rather 'an anonymous compilation in which both the old and the young fragments have found their places.' Such being the case, it is hardly proper to regard the work as a good old source for the knowledge of Buddhism. The reader finds in it the gradual development of the Buddha legend in its earliest beginnings. Hence, there is hardly any significance in the statement of Professor Vallée Poussin when he says that 'the *Lalitavistara* represents the popular Buddhism.' The book, however, is of great importance from the standpoint of literary history, inasmuch as it has supplied materials for the monumental epic of Aśvaghoṣa entitled the *Buddhacarita*.

To determine the date of composition of the work it would be necessary to bear in mind that the work is a Vaipulyasūtra. In the Vaipulyasūtras we find sections in a redaction of prose followed by one in verse, the latter being in substance, only a repetition of the former. The idiom of prose portions is a kind of Sanskrit ; while that of

**Date of  
Lalitavis-  
tara. Kern's  
view**

verses, Gāthās, a veiled Prākṛit somewhat clumsily Sanskritized as much as the exigencies of the metre have permitted. Professor Kern thinks that the prose passages are undoubtedly translations of a Prākṛit text into Sanskrit. The question, therefore, arises : why and when has the original idiom been replaced by Sanskrit ? It is known that in India it has been the common fate of all Prākṛits that they have become obsolete whilst the study and practice of Sanskrit have been kept up all over the country, as the common language of science and literature, and also as a bond between Aryans and Dravidians. Now it may be asked, at what time then might Sanskrit have reconquered its ascendancy ? Professor Kern suggests that it was in all probability shortly before or after the council in the reign of that great Indo-Scythian King Kanishka.

**Nariman's  
view and  
conclusions**

Mr. G. K. Nariman, in his Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism, says that it is an erroneous conception that the *Lalitavistara* was translated into Chinese in the first Christian era. Moreover, he doubts that the Chinese biography of Buddha, called the Phuyau-king, published in 300 A.D., is the second translation of our present text of the

*Lalitavistara*. On the other hand, he says that a precise rendering of the Sanskrit text was completed in Tibetan and it was produced as late as the fifth century A.D. It may, however, be noted here that Professor Kern has taken sufficient pains to prove that there is much that is of respectable antiquity in the work. Taking this factor into consideration its date may be assigned some time before the Christian era.

The most outstanding Buddhist writer in Sanskrit is Aśvaghoṣa. Round his date hangs a veil of mystery. Dr. Smith writes in his History of India : 'In literature, the memory of Kaniṣka is associated with the names of the eminent Buddhist writers Nāgārjuna, Aśvaghoṣa, and Vasumitra. Aśvaghoṣa is described as having been a poet, musician, scholar, religious controversialist, and zealous Buddhist monk, orthodox in creed, and a strict observer of discipline.' Judged from all evidences it may be concluded that Kaniṣka flourished in 78 A.D. Hence Aśvaghoṣa who adorned his court, flourished in the first century of the Christian era.<sup>1</sup>

**Aśvaghoṣa :  
his date**

<sup>1</sup> In the chronological group generally accepted by numismatics, the Kaniṣka group succeeds the Kadphi-

**Buddha-  
carita**

The masterpiece of Aśvaghosa is his *Buddhacarita*—the life-history of Buddha. From the account of I-tsing it appears that the *Buddhacarita* with which he was acquainted, consisted of *twenty-eight* cantos. The

ses group. But even this view has not the unanimous support of scholars. If, as some scholars hold, the group of kings comprising Kaniṣka, Vāsiṣka, Huviṣka and Vāsudeva preceded Kadphises I, the coins of the two princes last named should be found together, as they are not, and those of Kadphises II and Kaniṣka should not be associated, as they are. Chief supporters of the view stated above are Drs. Fleet, Frank and Mr. Kennedy. Dr. Frank lays stress on the fact that Chinese historians as apart from Buddhist authors make no mention of Kaniṣka. But he himself answers the question when he holds that with the year 125 A.D., the source was dried up from which the chronicler could draw the information regarding the peoples of Turkestan. Dr. Fleet connects Kaniṣka's accession to the throne with the traditional Vikrama Samvat, beginning with the year 57 B.C. This view has been ably controverted by Dr. Thomas and discoveries of Professor Marshall totally belie its truth. Inscriptions, coins and the records of Hiuen Tsang point out that Kaniṣka's dominion included Gandhāra. According to Chinese evidence, Kipin or Kāpiśa-Gandhāra was not under the Kuṣāṇa kings in the second half of the first century B.C. Professors Marshall, Sten Konow, Smith and other scholars think that Kaniṣka's rule begins about 125 A.D. The evidence of Sue Vihār

Tibetan translation, too, contains the same number of cantos. But unluckily the Sanskrit text comprises *seventeen* cantos only, of which, again, the last four are of dubious origin. It is said that one Amṛtānanda of

inscriptions proves that Kaniṣka's empire extended as far as the Lower Indus valley ; but the Junagaḍh inscription of Rudradāman tells us that the dominions of the Emperor included Sindhu and Sauvīra. It is known that Rudradāman lived from A.D. 130 to A.D. 150. Under the circumstances, it is almost impossible to reconcile the suzerainty of the Kuṣāṇa King with the independence of this powerful satrap (cf. *Svayama-dhigataṁ mahākṣatrapanāma*). From Kaniṣka's dates 3—23, Vāsiṣka's dates 24—28, Huviṣka's dates 31—60, and Vāsudeva's dates 74—98 it is almost evident that Kaniṣka was the originator of an era. But according to our evidence, no new era was in vogue about the beginning of the second century A.D. Dr. R. C. Mazumdar is of opinion that the era started by Kaniṣka was the Kalachuri era of 248-49 A.D. But Professor Jouveau Dubreuil contends that it is not likely that Vāsudeva's reign terminated after 100 years from Kaniṣka's date of accession ; for Mathurā where Vāsudeva reigned, came under the Nāgas about 350 A.D. It may be further mentioned that for the reason stated above we can hardly accept the theory of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who accepts A.D. 278, as the date of Kaniṣka's accession. According to Professors Ferguson, Oldenberg, Thomas, R. D. Banerjee, Rapson and others, Kaniṣka started the Śaka era commencing from 78 A.D.

the ninth century A.D. added these four cantos. Even the manuscript discovered by MM. Haraprasāda Śāstrin, reaches down to the middle of the fourteenth canto.

Professor Dubreuil does not accept the view as well on the following grounds. First, if the view that Kujula-kara-Kadphises and Hermaios reigned about 50 A.D. and that Kaniṣka founded the era in 78 A.D. is accepted, there remain only *twenty-eight* years for the end of the reign of Kadphises I and the entire reign of Kadphises II. But Kadphises II succeeded an octogenarian and it is not impossible that his reign was one of short duration. Professor Marshall says that Professor Dubreuil has discovered at Taxila a document which can be placed in 79 A.D. and the king, it mentions, was certainly not Kaniṣka. But Professor H. C. Ray Chaudhuri has shown that the title Devaputra was applicable to the Kaniṣka group and not to the earlier group. The omission of a personal name does not prove that the first Kuṣāṇa king was meant. Secondly, Professor Dubreuil says that Professor Sten Konow has shown that Tibetan and Chinese documents prove that Kaniṣka lived in the second century A.D. But it is not improbable that this Kaniṣka is the Kaniṣka of the Āra inscription of the year 41 which, if referred to the Śaka era, would give a date that would fall in the second century A.D. Po-t'iao may be one of the successors of Vāsudeva I. Professors Banerjee and Smith recognize the existence of more than one Vāsudeva. Finally, Professor Konow has shown that inscriptions of the Kaniṣka era and the Śaka era are not dated in



The *Buddhacarita* is really a work of art. Unlike the *Mahāvastu* and the *Lalitavistara*, it shows a systematic treatment of the subject-matter. Nowhere will the reader come across a confused or incoherent description. Throughout the work, the poet is very cautious about the use of figures of speech, and this abstinence from the superabundant employment of figures of speech has lent special charm to the merit of the work. Over and above this, the presentment of the miraculous in the Buddha legend has been done with equal moderation. Thus, in short, the work is an artistic creation. An account of the assemblage of fair and young ladies watching from gabled windows of high mansions, the exit of the royal prince from the capital, is followed by a vivid life-like description of how he came in contact with the hateful spectacle of senility. The

**A critical  
apprecia-  
tion**

the same manner. The learned scholar shows that the inscriptions of Kaniska are dated in different fashions. In the Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions, Kaniska follows the method of his Śaka-Pallava predecessors. On the other hand, in the Brāhmī inscriptions he follows the ancient Indian method. Is it then impossible that he adopted a third method to suit the local conditions in Western India ?

ladies, when they came to know that the prince was going out of the city, rushed to the window, careless of girdles falling off from their bodies and the poet speaks of their faces as so many full-blown lotuses with which the palace was decorated. The poet shows high artistic craftsmanship in depicting how the prince overcame the lures of sweet ladies who made an attempt to divert his mind from the desire to bid good-bye to all the joys and comforts of the world and also in the description of the famous scene in which the prince, gazing on the undecked bodies of the ladies, locked in the sweet embrace of sleep, resolved to abandon the palace. No less artistically pathetic is the scene in which the prince takes leave of his charioteer and the conversation between the two is remarkable for the spirit of absolute disinterestedness towards worldly happiness, which is displayed by the prince. The poet is also an adept in the description of battles, and no one will forget the spirited picture of the contest of Buddha against the demon Māra and his monstrous hosts. Evidences are also discernible in the work to show that the poet was familiar with the doctrine of statecraft.

Āśvaghoṣa is the author of another epic, the *Saundarananda*, which has been discovered and edited by MM. Haraprasāda Śāstrin. This work also turns round the history of Buddha's life, but the central theme is the history of the reciprocal love of Sundarī and Nanda, the half-brother of Buddha, who is initiated into the order against his will by the latter.

**Saundara-  
nanda**

The third work of the poet is a lyrical poem, the *Gaṇḍīstotragāthā*, reconstructed in the Sanskrit original from the Chinese by A. von Staël-Holstein.

**Gaṇḍīsto-  
tragāthā**

Another work of the poet is the *Sūtrālaṅkāra*,<sup>1</sup> which undoubtedly is a later production than the *Buddhacarita*, inasmuch as the former quotes the latter. It is to be regretted that the Sanskrit original is not yet available ; what we have is only the Chinese translation of the work. This *Sūtrālaṅkāra* is a collection of pious legends after the model of Jātakas and Avadānas. This work, however, has furnished us with a clue to the existence of dramatic

**Sūtrālaṅ-  
kāra**

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Winternitz is of opinion that this work was written by Kumāralāta, a junior contemporary of Āśvaghoṣa. The work bears the title *Kalpanāma-ṇḍitikā* or *Kalpanālaṅkṛtikā*.

literature even at the time Aśvaghōṣa. In the piece relating to Māra we have the recapitulation of a drama.

**Sāriputra-  
prakaraṇa**

There is a positive evidence to show that Aśvaghōṣa was a dramatist as well and in this connection reference may be made to the momentous discovery of the concluding portion of a *nine-act* drama entitled the *Śāriputraprakaraṇa* which treats of the conversion of Śāriputra and his friend Maudgalyāyana. Among the valuable manuscript treasures in palm-leaf recovered from Turfan there is a fragmentary manuscript in which Professor Lüders found this drama which bore the name of Aśvaghōṣa as its author.

**Mahāyāna-  
śraddhot-  
pādasūtra**

One more work attributed to the poet is the *Mahāyānaśraddhotpādasūtra*, a philosophical treatise on the basis of the Mahāyāna doctrine.<sup>1</sup> Herein, as Professor Lévi remarks, the author shows himself as a profound metaphysician, as an intrepid reviver of a doctrine which was intended to regenerate Buddhism. It is believed that the author came of a Brāhmana family and that he was later initiated into the doctrine of Buddhism.

<sup>1</sup> According to Dr. Winternitz this work has been wrongly ascribed to Aśvaghōṣa.

At first, he joined the Sarvāstivādin school and then prepared for the Mahāyāna. It was at one time believed that Āśvaghoṣa was a pioneer in the field of Mahāyānism ; but it is better to suppose that he was not the first to write a treatise on that subject, but was a strong exponent of it. For, it is undeniable that the Mahāyāna school developed long before Āśvaghoṣa.

Another work attributed to Āśvaghoṣa, is the *Vajrasūci*. Here the author takes up the Brāhmanic standpoint and disputes the authority of sacred texts and the claims of caste, and advocates the doctrine of equality. In the Chinese *Tipiṭaka* Catalogue the work has been ascribed to Dharmakīrti.<sup>1</sup>

**Vajrasūci**

Mātṛcetā is the mystical name of a Buddhist-Sanskrit poet who, according to the Tibetan historian Tārānātha, is none other than Āśvaghoṣa. According to I-tsing, Mātṛcetā is the author of the *Catussatkaṣṭotra* and the *Śatapañcāśatikanāmastotra*, two poems in four hundred and one hundred and fifty verses respectively. Fragments of the Sanskrit original of the former have been discovered in Central Asia.

**Mātṛcetā :  
his works**

<sup>1</sup> Vide, Bunyiu Nanjio, Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist *Tipiṭaka*, No. 1303.

The poems show some artistic excellence. Another work attributed to him is the *Mahārāja-Kanikalekha*.<sup>1</sup>

Āryacandra :  
Maitreyavyākaraṇa

Āryacandra belonging probably to the same period as that of Mātṛcetā, is known as the author of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* or the *Maitreyasamiti* which is in the form of a dialogue between Gotama Buddha and Śāriputra. The work, translated into various languages, seems to have been very popular.

Āryaśūra :  
Jātakamālā

Very well-known is the name of the poet Āryaśūra, the author of the popular *Jātakamālā*, written after the model of the *Sūtrālaṅkāra*. Among the frescoes in the caves of Ajantā, there are scenes from the *Jātakamālā* with inscribed strophes from Āryaśūra. The inscriptions belong to the sixth century A.D. ; but as another work of the poet was translated into Chinese in 434 A.D., he must have lived in the fourth century A.D.

Saddharma-  
mapuṇḍa-  
rika,  
Kāraṇḍa-  
vyūha,  
Sukhā-  
vatīvyūha  
and  
Akṣobhya-  
vyūha

The Buddhist Sanskrit literature belonging purely to the Mahāyāna school has preserved a number of books called the Mahāyānasūtras which are mainly devoted to the glorification of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. The most important of

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Thomas : Mātṛcetā and the Mahārāja-Kanikalekha (IA. Vol. XXXII).

them is the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* written in the manner of the Purāṇas. The book which is a glorification of Buddha Śākyamuni, contains elements of quite different periods ; for it is believed that Sanskrit prose and Gāthās in mixed Sanskrit could not have developed at the same time. The book was translated into Chinese between 225 A.D. and 316 A.D. The original, therefore, must have been composed not later than the second century A.D. Some scholars, however, like to give it an early date. But even Professor Kern has not been able to find out passages which may show any ancient thought. Another work is the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* preserved in two versions and betraying a theistic tendency. It contains a glorification of the Bodhisattva Avālokiteśvara. It was translated into Chinese as early as 270 A.D. The *Sukhāvatīvyūha* in which is glorified the Buddha Amitābha, is one more important book in which the reader may find a longing for spiritual liberation. The *Akṣobhyavyūha* which was translated into Chinese between 385 A.D. and 433 A.D., contains an account of Buddha Akṣobhya.

The philosophical writings of Buddhist

Philosophi-  
cal litera-  
ture

poets constitute no mean contribution to early Sanskrit literature. Among philosophical works belonging to the earliest Mahāyānasūtras mention should be made of the *Prajñāpāramitās* which occupy a unique place from the point of view of the history of religion. The Chinese translation of a *Prajñāpāramitā* was made as early as 179 A.D. Other philosophical Mahāyānasūtras are the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, the *Daśabhūmaka*, the *Ratnakūṭa*, the *Rāstrapāla*, the *Laṅkāvatāra*, the *Samādhirāja* and the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*.

Nāgārjuna :  
his works

The *Mādhyamikakārikā* which is a systematic philosophical work of the class with which we are familiar in the Brāhmaṇic philosophical literature was written in a metrical form (in *four hundred* verses) by Nāgārjuna whose name is associated with the Kuṣāṇa King Kaniṣka.<sup>1</sup> Nāgārjuna is also known as the author of the *Akutobhaya*, a commentary on his own work, which is preserved in a Tibetan translation. The *Yuktiśaṭikā*, the *Śūnyatā-saptati*, the *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya*, the *Mahāyānavimśaka*, the *Vigrahavyāvartanī*,

<sup>1</sup> Some think that Nāgārjuna lived at the close of the second century A.D.



the *Ekaslokaśāstra*, the *Prajñādaṇḍa* and a few commentaries are his other works. There is another work the *Dharmasaṅgraha*, which passes as his composition.<sup>1</sup>

In the Chinese translations (404 A.D.) of the biographies of Aśvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna, there occurs the name of one Āryadeva. His *Catuṣṣataka* is a work on the Mādhyamika system and is a polemic directed against the Brāhmaṇic ritual. His other works are the *Dvādaśanikāyaśāstra* and the *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa*. Maitreya-nātha, the real founder of the Yogācāra school, is the author of the *Abhisamayālaṅkārikās*, translated into Chinese probably in the fourth century A.D. Ārya Asaṅga, the famous student of Maitreya-nātha, wrote the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* besides a few works all preserved in Chinese translations. Vasubandhu Asaṅga, a strong adherent of the Sarvāstivādin school, whom Professor Takakusu places between 420 A.D. and 500 A.D. and to whom Professor Wogihara assigns a date between 390 A.D. and 470 A.D., wrote the *Abhidharmakośa* and the *Paramārthasaptati* to combat the Sāṅkhya

Āryadeva,  
Maitreya-  
nātha,  
Ārya  
Asaṅga  
and  
Vasubandhu  
Asaṅga :  
their works

<sup>1</sup> The *Suhrillekha* is ascribed to Nāgārjuna. It contains no Mādhyamika doctrine.

philosophy. In his later life, when he is believed to have been converted into Mahāyāna, he wrote the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*.

**Dignāga :  
his works**

Dignāga is the chief of the early philosophers who had made valuable contribution through his masterpieces, the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* and the *Nyāyapraveśa*. He lived probably in the fifth century A.D. To the same century probably belonged Sthiramati and Dharmapāla who wrote valuable commentaries on the Mādhyamika system.<sup>1</sup>

**Avadāna  
literature**

The vast field of Avadāna literature presents a good and sufficient specimen of Sanskrit writing by Buddhist poets. The word *avadāna* signifies a 'great religious or moral achievement as well as the history of a great achievement'. Such a great act may consist in the sacrifice of one's own life, but also may be confined to the founding of an institution for the supply of incense, flowers, gold and jewels to, or the building of, sanctuaries. Avadāna stories are designed to inculcate that dark (ignoble) deeds bear

<sup>1</sup> Later philosophical works, belonging to definitely identified schools of Buddhism, e.g., the works of Yaśomitra, Candrakīrti, Śāntideva, Dharmakīrti, Dharmottara and others, will be treated in detail in a subsequent chapter on Philosophy.

dark (ignoble) fruits while white (noble) acts beget white (noble) fruits. Thus they are also tales of *karman*.

The *Avadānaśataka* heads the list of works on Avadāna literature. It consists of ten decades each having a theme of its own. Another work, the *Karmaśataka*, preserved only in the Tibetan translation, bears close affinity to the former. Yet another collection of stories in Tibetan (translated, of course, from original Sanskrit) is known in the world's literature as 'Dsanglun.'

**Avadāna-  
śataka and  
Karmaśa-  
taka**

A well-known collection of Avadāna literature is the *Divyāvadāna*. The book belongs broadly to the Hīnayāna school ; but traces of Mahāyānistic influence may yet be discovered. The collection is composed of many materials and no uniformity of language is, therefore, possible. But the language is lucid, and true poetry is not wanting. The book has a great importance from the standpoint of Indian sociology. As regards the time of redaction, it may be said that as Aśoka's successors down to Puṣyamitra are mentioned and the word *dīnāra* is frequently used, a date prior to the second century A.D., can hardly be assigned to it.

**Divyāva-  
dāna**

Mention may be made of the *Aśokāva-*

Aśokāva-  
dāna, Kal-  
padrumā-  
vadānamālā,  
Ratnāvadā-  
namālā,  
Dvāviṃśa-  
tyavadāna  
and minor  
avadānas

*dāna*, the cycle of stories having for its central theme the history of Aśoka. Historically, these stories have little or no value. The work was translated into Chinese as early as the third century A.D. A passing reference may be made to the *Kalpadrūmāvadānamālā*, the *Ratnāvadānamālā* and the *Dvāviṃśatyavadāna*, the materials of which are drawn from the *Avadānaśataka*. Three more works the *Bhadrakalpāvadāna*, the *Vratāvadānamālā* and the *Vicitrakarṇikāvadāna* are known to us in manuscripts only.<sup>1</sup>

#### REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
Kern, H. : Manual of Buddhism.  
Nariman, G. K. : Literary History of Sanskrit  
Buddhism.  
Raychaudhuri, H. C. : Political History of An-  
cient India.  
Smith, V. A. : Oxford History of India.  
Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature,  
Vol. II.

---

<sup>1</sup> A most extensive work on Avadāna literature is the *Avadānakalpalatā* of Kṣemendra of the eleventh century A.D. The work has been written in the style of ornate Court-epics.

## CHAPTER SIX

### COURT-EPICS

#### A

### INTRODUCTION

Authoritative writers on Sanskrit rhetoric have given an exhaustive list of the characteristics of epic poems in Classical Sanskrit. These characteristics may be divided under *two* heads. Of them the essential characteristics, the more important, are based on the conception of the *three* constituents of poetry, viz., the plot (*vastu*) the hero (*netṛ*) and the sentiment (*rasa*).<sup>1</sup> The plot of an epic must have a historical basis and should not be fictitious. The hero must be an accomplished person of high lineage and should be of the type technically called

**Character-  
istics : es-  
sential**

<sup>1</sup> Generally the sentiments are *eight* in number, viz., *śṛṅgāra* (erotic), *hāsyā* (comic), *karuṇā* (pathetic), *raudra* (furious), *vīra* (heroic), *bhayānaka* (terrible), *bībhatsa* (disgustful) and *adbhuta* (marvellous). It is held by some that the *śānta* (quietistic) was added later on by Abhinavagupta, the erudite commentator on Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. This was perhaps added for representing the spirit of *mahāprasthāna* in the *Mahābhārata*. It is even argued that Bharata has enumerated the eight sentiments for the drama only, and not for the epic.

Dhīrodātta Delineation of various sentiments and emotions is the third characteristic.

Character-  
istics :  
non-essen-  
tial

The non-essential characteristics which are formal and apply only to technique, are many in number. They demand (i) that the epic should begin with a benediction, salutation or statement of facts, (ii) that chapters or sections should bear the appellation *sarga*, (iii) that the number of cantos should not exceed *thirty* and should not be less than *eight*, (iv) that the number of verses in each canto should not generally be less than *thirty* and should not exceed *two hundred*, (v) that there should be descriptions of sunrise and sunset pools and gardens, amorous sports and pleasure-trips and the like, (vi) that the development of the plot should be natural and the *five* junctures of the plot (*sandhis*) should be well-arranged, and (vii) that the last two or three stanzas of each canto should be composed in a different metre or metres.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It is easy to find that these characteristics are not always present in every epic. The *Haravijaya* in *fifty* cantos, some cantos of the *Naiṣadhiyacarita* containing more than *two hundred* verses and the first canto of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* having only *twenty-seven* verses, are examples to the point.

## B

### GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF COURT-EPICS

The name of Āśvaghoṣa has come down to us as one of the earliest known epic poets. An account of his two great epics the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda* has already been given in a preceding chapter.

Āśvaghoṣa

The next great epic poet is Kālidāsa whose age can hardly be determined with any amount of precision. It is most deplorable that scholars differ widely in their opinions in fixing the age of this prince of Indian poets. The most popular theory of the day states that the poet flourished during the reign of Candragupta II (380 A.D.—415 A.D.), that his powers were at their highest during the reign of Kumāragupta I (415 A.D.—455 A.D.) and that he lived to see the reign of Skandagupta (455 A.D.—480 A.D.)<sup>1</sup>

Kālidāsa :  
his age

<sup>1</sup>The date of Kālidāsa is one of the most perplexing questions in the history of Sanskrit literature and the opinions of scholars, however ingeniously conceived, fail to give us definiteness and certainty. It is a fact to be regretted that India has not preserved the history of her greatest poet and dramatist. Tradition has been busy in weaving round the name of Kālidāsa many fictitious stories and it is almost impossible to

**Kumāra-  
sambhava**

The *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa is an epic in *seventeen* cantos of which the first *eight* are belived to be genuine. Mallinātha writes his commentary on the first eight

separate at such a distant date the historical fact from its rich colouring of fables. The traditional theory makes Kālidāsa a contemporary of the Vikrama Samvat, the initial year of which is 57 B.C. Among the chief supporters of this theory are the late Sir William Jones, Dr. Peterson, Principal S. Roy, and Mr. I. R. Bālasubrahmanyam. Principal Roy has argued that the Bhītā medallion found near Allahabad by Dr. Marshall in 1909-10 A.D. pictures a scene which looks exactly like the opening scene of the *Śākuntala*. The medallion belongs to the Śūnga period 185-73 B.C. Moreover, the diction and style of Kālidāsa definitely establishes him as a predecessor of Aśvaghoṣa who has made use of the description of Aja's entry to the capital found in the *Raghuvamśa*, and has borrowed Kālidāsa's words and style. But archæologists are of opinion that the scene found in the Allahabad Bhītā medallion cannot be definitely proved to be identical with the scene in the *Śākuntala*. Professor Cowell in his edition of the *Buddhacarita* remarks that it is Kālidāsa who imitates Aśvaghoṣa and not vice versa. Mr. Bālasubrahmanyam has based his theory on the internal evidences found in Kālidāsa's dramas. Thus the epilogue of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* supports that Kālidāsa lived in the reign of Agnimitra, the son of Puṣyamitra, of the first century B.C. The system of law, specially that of inheritance, as found



cantos alone. There is also difference of opinion regarding the propriety of the theme of the later cantos. The theme of the epic is the marriage of Lord Śiva and Umā and the

in the *Śṅkuntala*, points to the fact that the poet must have lived before the beginning of the Christian era. Moreover, there was one Vikramāditya in Ujjayinī in the first century B.C., and Kālidāsa's works indirectly allude to him, as the poet lived in his court.

Dr. Peterson has no particular argument to take his stand upon. He simply writes, "Kālidāsa stands near the beginning of the Christian era if indeed he does not overtop it". Sir Willam Jones in his introduction to the *Śṅkuntala* advances no argument but accepts the B.C. theory.

Another theory places Kālidāsa in the sixth century A.D. The late MM. Haraprasāda Śāstrin, one of the supporters of this theory, has pointed out that the defeat of Hūṇas by Raghu in course of his world-conquest, refers to the conquest of Hūṇas by Skandagupta (455 A.D.—480 A.D.). And the terms Dignāga and Nicula, occurring in the *Megha-lūta*, refer to the great teachers who lived before Kālidāsa. Professor Max Müller, another adherent of this doctrine, has based his theory on the suggestions of Professor Fergusson who points out that the era of the Mālavas was put back to 56 B.C., and Yaśodharma-deva Viṣṇuvardhana Vikramāditya who conquered the Hūṇas in 544 A.D., commemorated his victory by starting the Mālava era. But in doing so, he willingly antedated it by 600 years. Fergusson's theory (known as

birth of Kārttikeya who vanquished the demon Tāraka. Scholars are of opinion that the work is one of the first compositions of the poet.

Raghu-  
vaṁśa

The *Raghuvamśa*, which is undoubtedly a production of a mature hand, deals with the life-history of the kings of the Ikṣvāku family in general and of Rāma in particular.

the Korur theory), however, has been exploded by Dr. Fleet who pointed out by his researches that there was no Vikramāditya who achieved a victory over the Hūṇas in 544 A.D., and furthermore, that there was in existence an era known as the Mālava era long before 544 A.D. Thus the theory of Professor Max Muller is without any historical value. In this connection, mention may be made of his once popular and now discarded 'Renaissance Theory of Classical Sanskrit Literature', which states that there was a revival of the Sanskrit learning and literature in the wake of the Gupta civilization and culture and that Kālidāsa was the best flower of this age.

It is, however, generally believed that Kālidāsa flourished in the reign of Candragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty (380 A.D.—415 A.D.). But it has been argued that his best works were written during the reign of Kumāragupta I (415 A.D.—455 A.D.). But some would like to suggest that the poet lived to see the reign of Skandagupta (455 A.D.—480 A.D.). It should be noted, however, that both Candragupta and Skandagupta held the title of 'Vikramāditya', while Kumāragupta had the title of 'Mahendrāditya'.

The epic which is composed in *nineteen* cantos, is the tale of Vālmīki retold with the mastery of a finished poet. It is said that the work fulfils to a considerable extent the conditions of Sanskrit epic poetry.

It is not difficult to surmise the date of Bhāravi as his name is mentioned along with Kālidāsa in the famous Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II, dated 634 A.D. Bhāravi has to his credit only one epic, viz., the *Kirātārjunīya* which is based on the *Mahābhārata*. The poem describes how Arjuna obtained the Pāśupata weapon from Śiva. The work is in *nineteen* cantos and is written in an ornate style, though full of dignity of sense (*arthagaurava*) with occasional jingling of words.

**Bhāravi :**  
**Kirātār-**  
**junīya**

Nowhere in the literature of the world can be found a single instance where poetry has been written with the sole object of illustrating the rules and principles of grammar. The *Bhāṭṭikāvya* or *Rāvaṇavadha* which is written in *twenty-two* cantos, is divided into *four* sections, viz., *Prakīrṇakāṇḍa*, *Prasannakāṇḍa*, *Alaṅkāra-kāṇḍa* and *Tīnanta-kāṇḍa*. The poem is an epic depicting the life-history of Rāma from his birth up to the time of Rāvaṇa's death. The author of this

**Bhāṭṭi :**  
**Rāvaṇa-**  
**vadha**

epic, Bhaṭṭi, must be distinguished from the great grammarian-philosopher Bhartṛhari, popularly known as Hari. The author writes in his own work that he lived in Valabhī under one Śrīdharasena. History gives us four Dharasenas, the last of whom died in 651 A.D. It is, therefore, probable that Bhaṭṭi flourished in the latter half of the sixth and the first quarter of the seventh century A.D. It may be mentioned in this connection that Bhaṭṭi lived before Bhāmaha, the great rhetorician who decries the poetic excellence of the *Rāvaṇavadha*.<sup>1</sup> Though the work is a grammatical poem, still in more places than one the poet has given ample proof of his artistic talents. The second, tenth and twelfth cantos of the poem may be cited as instances.

Kumāradāsa, said to be the King of Ceylon from 517 A.D. to 526 A.D., is mentioned as a poet of remarkable talent by Rājaśekhara. It is maintained by Dr. Keith that the poet knew the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (650 A.D.), and was known to Vāmana (800 A.D.). The theme of his poem, the *Jānakīharaṇa*, in *twenty-five* cantos, is taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as the

Kumāra-  
dāsa :  
Jānakī-  
haraṇa

<sup>1</sup> *KL.* II. 20.

century A.D. The work is written in *twenty-two* cantos. The poet is a scholar of repute in the different systems of Indian philosophy and has a thorough command over grammar and lexicon. Though he does not show that power of poetical suggestion which distinguishes the writings of great Indian poets like Kālidāsa, his power of expression is singularly captivating. What strikes us as his defect is that he has a special liking for exaggerated statements in the form of poetic conceit.

---

C

### LESSER EPIC POEMS

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <i>Jāmbavatīvijaya</i><br>and<br><i>Pātāla-vijaya</i> : | }  | ascribed to Pāṇini—according to some, the two are the names of the one and the same book—not free from grammatical errors—the authorship is much disputed. |
| <br>  |  |  |
| <i>Vāraruca-kāvya</i> :                                 | lost to us.  |  |
| <i>Padyacūḍāmaṇi</i> :                                  | ascribed to Buddhaghoṣa (not later than the fifth century A.D.).   |  |
| <i>Kunteśvaradautya</i> :                               | ascribed to Kālidāsa by Kṣemendra.   |  |
| <br>  |  |  |
| <i>Hayagrīvavadha</i> :                                 | a lost work by Bhartṛmenṭha who flourished under Mātṛgupta of the sixth century A.D.—praised by Rājaśekhara. |  |

*Padmapurāṇa* : by Raviṣeṇa of the seventh century A.D.—containing a glorification of R̥ṣabha, the first Tīrthakara.

<i>Rāvaṇārjunīya</i>	}	by Bhaumaka—written in
or,		<i>twenty-seven</i> cantos in the
<i>Ārjunarāvaṇīya</i>		fashion of Bhaṭṭi—based on the strife between Kārtavīrya and Rāvaṇa.

*Harivaiṣṇapurāṇa* . by Jinasena of the eighth century A.D.—in *sixty-six* cantos—describing the story of the *Mahābhārata* in a Jinistic setting.

*Kapphaṇḍabhyudaya* . by Śivasvamin, a Kāshmirian Buddhist, during the reign of Avantivarman of the ninth century A.D.—written in *twenty* cantos—based on a tale in the *Avadānaśataka*.

*Haraviṣaya* : by Ratnākara, a Kāshmirian of the ninth century A.D.—based on the slaying of the demon Andhaka by Śiva—written in *fifty* cantos—influenced by Bāṇa and Māgha.

*Rūghavapāṇḍavīya* : by Kavirāja—mentioned by Rājaśekhara—probably of the ninth century A.D.—giving us the two stories of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* simultaneously through *double entendre*.

*Mahāpurāṇa* : by Jinasena and Guṇabhadra of the ninth century A.D.—containing *two* parts, the *Ādipurāṇa* and the *Uttarapurāṇa*.

*Pārśvābhyudaya* : by Jinasena of the ninth century A.D. who has incorporated the entire *Meghadūta* while relating the story of Pārśvanātha.

*Kādambarīkathāsūtra* : by Abhinanda, son of the logician Jayantabhaṭṭa of the tenth century A.D.

*Yaśodharacarita* : by Vādirāja of the first quarter of the tenth century A.D.—written in *four* cantos.

*Kavirahasya* : by Halāyudha of the tenth century A.D.—containing an eulogy of King Kṛṣṇa III—written after the style of Bhaṭṭi.

*Rāmacarita* : by Abhinanda, son of Śātānanda of unknown date.

*Rāmāyaṇamañjarī* } by Kṣemendra of the eleventh  
and *Bhāratamañjarī* } century A.D.

*Yaśodharacaritra* : by Maṇikyasūri of the eleventh century A.D.

*Harivilāsa* : by Lolimbarāja of the eleventh century A.D.

*Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* : by Maṅkha—a Kāshmirian and a pupil of Ruyyaka of the twelfth century A.D.—written in *twenty-five* cantos—based on the tale of the destruction of the demon Tripura by Śiva.

*Śatruñjayamāhātmya* : by Dhaneśvara of the twelfth century A.D.—written in *fourteen* cantos—containing a glorification of the sacred mountain Śatruñjaya.

*Triśaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacarita* : by Hemacandra of 1088-1172 A.D.—a highly important work, its seventh book being called the *Jaina-Rāmāyaṇa*, the tenth entitled the *Mūhāvīracarita*, containing the life-story of Mahāvīra, and its appendix-section, the *Parīṣiṣṭaparvan*, being a mine of fairy tales and stories. .

*Dharmaśarmābhyudaya* : by Haricandra of unknown date—written in *twenty-one* cantos.

*Neminirvāṇa* : by Vāgbhaṭa of the twelfth century A.D.—in *fifteen* cantos—dealing with Neminātha's life.

*Bālabhārata* : by Amaracandra of the thirteenth century A.D.

*Pāṇḍavacaritra* and *Mṛgavaticaritra* } : by Devaprabhasūri of the thirteenth century A.D.

*Pārśvanāthacarita* : by Bhāvadevasūri of the thirteenth century A.D.

*Harivaṁśa* : by Sakalakīrti and his pupil Jinadāsa of the fifteenth century A.D.

*Rasikūñjana* : by Rāmacandra of the sixteenth century A.D.—describing the two sentiments of love and asceticism through *double entendre*.

*Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* : by Śubhacandra of the sixteenth century A.D.—also called the *Jaina-Mahābhārata*.

*Rūghavanaiśadhīya* : by Haradattasūri of unknown date.

*Rūghavapūṇḍavīyayūdavīya* : by Cidambara of unknown date.

### REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature, Vol. II.



## CHAPTER SEVEN

### DRAMA

#### A

### ORIGIN OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

Orthodox  
view

The origin of Sanskrit drama is a most interesting study in the history of Sanskrit literature and divergent views are found amongst scholars which can hardly be reconciled. It is an undeniable fact that Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the earliest known book on Sanskrit dramaturgy. The third century A.D. is the generally accepted date of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, and some scholars hold that the book is a compilation on the basis of an original work of the Sūtra-type. According to a legend found in this book, Brahmā created drama by taking passages for recitation from the *Rgveda*, songs from the *Sāma-veda*, gestures from the *Yajurveda* and emotions from the *Atharvaveda*. Thus a drama is known as the fifth Veda. From Siva and Pārvatī, Tāṇḍava and Lāsya dances were obtained and Viṣṇu gave the Rīti. The same book also informs us that the dramas were enacted during the Indradhvaja festival where the sons and disciples of the sage Bharata together with Gandharvas and Apsarases took

part in the play. The first two plays enacted were the *Amṛtamanthana* and the *Tripuradāha* both written by Brahṁā himself.)

There was a time when the theory of the Greek-origin of Indian drama found its adherents amongst scholars.<sup>1</sup> The chief exponent was Professor Windisch (1882) who found many striking similarities between Greek and Sanskrit plays and based his theory on the ground that Indians were in touch with Greeks for a considerable period after the invasion of Alexander and that none of the extant Sanskrit plays belongs to a pre-Christian date. Thus to him the very classification into acts, the prologues and the epilogues, the way in which the actors make their entrance and exit, the term *yavanikā*, the theme and its manipulation, the variety of stage-directions, the typical characters like the Vidūṣaka, Pratināyaka, etc.,—all smell of Greek origin. This theory was further corroborated by the discovery in the Sītābeṅgā cave, of the Greek theatre in its Indian imitation.<sup>2</sup> But this theory has

**Theory of  
Greek  
Origin**

<sup>1</sup> The suggestion came from Professor Weber, but Professor Pischel vehemently repudiated it.

<sup>2</sup> On the antiquities of Ramgarh Hill, District of Sargujā—IA. Vol. II.

been rejected as the points of contrast are far too many. The absence of the *three unities of Time, Space and Action* in a Sanskrit drama brings it nearer to an Elizabethan drama than to a Greek drama where the three unities are essential. The difference in time between two acts in a Sanskrit drama may be several years (e. g., the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti where twelve years intervene between the incidents of the first two acts). Moreover, it is only in a particular act of a Sanskrit drama that the actions which happen in a single place are usually represented. Thus while the sixth act of the *Śākuntala* represents the scene at King Duṣyanta's palace, the seventh act shows the scene at sage Mārīca's hermitage on the top of the Himālayas and the first part of it represents the king's aerial journey. As for the term *yavanikā*, most scholars think that it is of later introduction and it refers to Persian tapestries and not to anything Greek.

On the other hand, there are some scholars who want to determine the origin of Sanskrit dramas in the same manner in which Western scholars seek to explain the origin of European plays. So it has been argued that as the first Sanskrit play is stated

to have been produced at the Indradhvaja festival (which has a parallel in the May-pole dance in Europe), the origin of Sanskrit dramas is to be connected with the festivities of the spring after the passing away of the winter. But this theory is rejected as MM. Haraprasāda Śāstrin has pointed out that the aforesaid Indradhvaja festival comes off at the end of the rains.

Professor Ridgeway has connected the origin of Indian drama with the worshipping of dead ancestors. But the theory is inapplicable to the case of Indian Aryans whose ritual of the disposing of the dead has the minimum ostentation.

**Ridgeway's  
theory**

The Kṛṣṇa-worship is thought by some scholars to be the origin of Sanskrit plays. Thus the role which the Śauraseni Prākṛit plays in a Sanskrit drama is easily explained. But this theory involves anachronism, as it remains to be proved that Kṛṣṇa dramas are the earliest Sanskrit dramas.<sup>1</sup>

**Kṛṣṇa-cult  
origin**

Professor Pischel has set forth the theory that Sanskrit drama in its origin was a puppet-play. The stage-manager in a Sans-

**Pischel's  
theory**

<sup>1</sup> It may be proved in the same way that the theories of the Viṣṇu-cult, Śiva-cult or Rāma-cult origin of Indian drama cannot be accepted.

krit drama is called Sūtradhāra (the holder of the string) and his assistant Sthāpaka is to enter immediately after the stage-manager and is expected to place in proper position, the plot, the hero or the germ of the play. The puppets also are frequently mentioned in Sanskrit literature ; they could be made to dance or move about and they could even be made to talk. Such a talking puppet, impersonating Sītā, is found in one of Rājaśekhara's plays. The episode of the Shadow-Sītā in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita* is reminiscent of the old shadow-play in ancient India. But this theory cannot furnish sufficient explanation of Sanskrit drama in all its bearings, such as, the mixture of prose and verse in a Sanskrit play, as also the varieties of languages and the like.<sup>1</sup>

Origin to  
be traced to  
the Vedic  
period

Another theory on this subject states that the origin of Sanskrit drama should be sought in the Samvāda-hymns of the *R̥gveda*. These ballad hymns which are nearly twenty in number, are marked by a dramatic spirit.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Professor Hillebrandt has argued that Professor Pischel's theory cannot be accepted as the puppet-play assumes the pre-existence of the drama.

<sup>2</sup> *RV.* I. 165. 170 and 179, III. 33, IV. 18, VII. 33, VIII. 100, X. 11, 28, 51—53, 86, 95 and 108, etc.

There are no specific ritualistic applications accompanying these Sāṃvāda-hymns and they seem to have been recited between the intervals of long sacrificial sessions (pāriplava) for the satisfaction of the patrons of sacrifices. But whether the hymns were treated as ballads (as Professors Pischel and Geldner thought); or as regular ritualistic dramas with actual stage-directions and action including singing and dancing (as held by Professor von Schroeder); or, finally as narrative stories with an admixture of prose to connect the poems into one whole, with a preponderance of dialogue (as maintained by Professor Oldenberg)—is still keenly disputed amongst scholars.<sup>1</sup>

It has been universally found that the growth of drama is intimately connected with royal patronage. And India is no exception. Bearing in our mind the existence of the ritualistic drama which marks the early beginnings of Indian plays we can boldly assert that Sanskrit drama is a product of the Indian mind which viewed life in all its various aspects and passed through many stages of development, being

**Conclu-  
sion**

<sup>1</sup> Professor Hertel has found a full drama in the *Suparṇādhyaṃya*.

influenced by Jainism and Buddhism in its allegorical sphere or by any other foreign factor and yet maintaining its own peculiarity. No one theory, therefore, can adequately explain all its features and as such one should refrain from making a choice of any one of them.

---

## B

### CHARACTERISTICS OF SANSKRIT DRAMA .

**Predomi-  
nance of  
sentiment**

According to Indian thinkers, the best of poets is a dramatist. Sanskrit drama evolved in all its aspects in a particularly Indian atmosphere. Sanskrit dramatists with their inherent aesthetic sense gave more importance to the portrayal of the sentiment than to the character or the plot. Sanskrit dramas were, therefore, highly idealistic and romantic in their character. Though the best of Sanskrit dramas glow with occasional touches of realism, still the fact cannot be denied that the poetic value has never been sacrificed for direct delineation of action or character. Nevertheless we cannot say that

Sanskrit dramatists were totally indifferent to the action of a drama, and it has been said clearly that a drama must have *five* critical junctures of plot (*sandhi*), viz., *mukha* (opening or *protasis*), *pratimukha* (progression or *epitasis*), *garbha* (development or *catastasis*), *vimarśa* (pause or *peripeteia*) and *nirrahaṇa* (conclusion or *catastrophe*). It has been the usual convention with Sanskrit poets that they select the Erotic, the Heroic or the Quietistic as the principal sentiment in a Nāṭaka (the type of major dramas) which is assisted by every other sentiment according to propriety. It needs to be added here that in the opinion of some thinkers, the aforesaid convention should not command any respect and any one of the nine sentiments may be the predominant sentiment in a Nāṭaka.

A charge is often levelled by critics that Sanskrit drama is marked by an absence of tragedy ; but it may be answered by saying that what is known as *Vipralambha-śṛṅgāra* (love-in-separation) more than compensates for the comparatively rare 'Pathetic' which is the prominent sentiment in only one class of minor dramas. But it is a fact that Sanskrit dramas have never a tragic catas-

**Absence of  
tragedy**



trophe, and the reason is to be found in the conception that it mars the sentiment. Hence the representation of death, murder, war, revolution and anything indecorous which is a hiatus in aesthetic pleasure, has been prohibited on the stage.

### **Hero**

As the main interest in Sanskrit drama lies in the creation of the sentiment, it is convenient for a dramatist to take a plot with a popular theme. The hero of the drama must be an accomplished person of high lineage and should belong to the Dhi-rodātta type. He must be a hero either of the earth or of heaven, and sometimes even we find in Sanskrit drama gods side by side with mortal men, and thus is given ample scope to the dramatist's imagination to create the appropriate romantic atmosphere.

### **Morality and drama**

Like every other branch of Indian literature, Sanskrit drama has also a religious basis and nothing violating the moral and religious code has been represented in Sanskrit drama.

---

## C

### CLASSIFICATION OF SANSKRIT DRAMAS

It must be said at the outset that the Sanskrit synonym for drama is Rūpaka and not Nāṭaka, the latter being a variety of the former which has a more comprehensive import. Authors on Sanskrit dramaturgy have classified Sanskrit dramas into *two* types : (1) the major (Rūpaka) and (2) the minor (Uparūpaka). The varieties of each type differ according to different authorities. The following is the list given by Viśvanātha in his *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of the varieties of the two types of Sanskrit dramas :

Rūpaka &  
Uparūpaka

1. The major type : (i) Nāṭaka (e.g., *Abhijñānaśakuntala* of Kālidāsa) (ii) Prakaraṇa (e.g., *Mālatīmādhava* of Bhavabhūti) (iii) Bhāṇa (e.g., *Karpūracarita* of Vatsarāja) (iv) Vyāyoga (e.g., *Madhyama-vyāyoga* of Bhāsa) (v) Samavakāra (e.g., *Samudramathanā* of Vatsarāja) (vi) Dima (e.g., *Tripuradāha* of Vatsarāja) (vii) Īhāmṛga (e.g., *Rukmiṇīharaṇa* of Vatsarāja) (viii) Aṅka or Utsrṣṭikāṅka (e.g., *Śarmisthāyayāti*) (ix) Vīthi (e.g., *Mālavikā*) and (x) Prahasana (e.g., *Mattavilāsa* of Mahendravikramavarman).

2. The minor type : (i) Nāṭikā (e.g., *Ratnāvalī* of Śrī-Harṣa) (ii) Troṭaka (e.g., *Vikramorvaṣī* of Kālidāsa) (iii) Goṣṭhī (e.g., *Raivatamaḍanikā*) (iv) Saṭṭaka (e.g., *Karpūramañjarī* of Rājaśekhara) (v) Nāṭyarā-saka (e.g., *Vilāsavatī*) (vi) Prasthāna (e.g., *Śṛṅgāratilaka*) (vii) Ullāpya (e.g., *Devīmāhādeva*) (viii) Kāvya (e.g., *Yādavodaya*) (ix) Preṅkhaṇa (e.g., *Vālivadhā*) (x) Rāsaka (e.g., *Menakāhita*) (xi) Saṁlāpaka (e.g., *Māyākāpālīka*). (xii) Śṛīgadita (e.g., *Kṛīḍārasātala*) (xiii) Śīlpaka (e.g., *Kanakāvatīmādhava*) (xiv) Vilāsikā (no work mentioned in *SD*.) (xv) Durmālikā (e.g., *Bindumatī*) (xvi) Prakaraṇikā (no work mentioned in *SD*.) (xvii) Hallīsa (e.g., *Keliraivataka*) and (xviii) Bhāṇikā (e.g., *Kāmadattā*).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The works, against which authors are mentioned, have now been published and are all available. The other works are only mentioned by the author of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* and are not actually known to exist at present.

## GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

The Indian drama can be traced to the fifth or the fourth century B.C. Pāṇini refers to dramatic aphorisms<sup>1</sup> and the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, which is a book of the fourth century B.C., contains reference to the term *Kuśīlava*, which may have an allusion to the twin sons of Rāma or to the proverbially bad character of actors. The *Mahābhāṣya*, beside its reference to the dramas, *Kaṁsavaidha* and *Balibandha*, speaks of the painting of actors and of the three kinds of artists. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* we find the mention of Nāṭaka and the *Mahābhārata* refers to a wooden feminine figure.<sup>2</sup> In the *Harivaṁśa*, however, we find unmistakable reference to a full-fledged drama acted by Kṛṣṇa's descendants. But Dr. Keith looks upon all these evidences as mere references to pantomimes and not to pure dramas. He, however, admits that the dramas of Aśva-ghoṣa and Bhāsa, the first extant dramas,

Introduc-  
tion

<sup>1</sup> Aṣṭ IV. iii. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Mbh. III. xxx. 23.

are not the earliest specimens of Indian plays, inasmuch as they show much polish and exquisite finish.<sup>1</sup> The earliest extant Sanskrit drama according to European scholars is the *Śāriputrāprakaraṇa* of Aśvaghoṣa which was discovered sometime ago in Turfan in Central Asia.

**Bhāsa :  
age and  
authorship**

The Bhāsa-problem has in recent years been a most interesting topic for discussion in the history of Sanskrit drama. It has drawn the attention of many scholars widely differing in their opinions on the authenticity and authorship of the plays of Bhāsa. Credit goes to MM. Gaṇapati Śāstrin who first published the *thirteen* plays of Bhāsa in 1912. But for his editorship, the plays of Bhāsa would have remained mere fictitious names. Bhāsa is mentioned by Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Rājaśekhara and others. MM. G. Śāstrin, the editor, fixed the third century B.C. or earlier as the date for Bhāsa ; but European scholars would not agree on the evidence of Prākṛit. They would like to place the author of these plays in the third century A.D.

Bhāsa's myriad-mindedness is well

<sup>1</sup>Aśvaghoṣa has followed the rules of Sanskrit dramaturgy ; the higher characters use Sanskrit, while others speak Prākṛit.

reflected in the number of his plays and the variety of their themes. The style of Bhāsa is simple, at the same time forceful, and conforms to what is known as the Vaidarbha style. The initial characteristic of the dramas of Bhāsa is action which has never been sacrificed for poetry and poetic charm. In fact, the plays of Bhāsa are really of dramatic value and qualities of a very high order. On the other hand, there are scholars who hold that the dramas in their present forms are not the composition of one and the same poet, but they are the composite product of the plagiarism of many scribes. Some scholars have gone so far even as to surmise the existence of a genuine Bhāsa of whose works the extant plays are mere abridgement by the traditional players of Southern India (especially Kerala).

**Apprecia-  
tion**

The *thirteen* plays of Bhāsa may be arranged under *three* heads according to the sources from which the plots have been taken :—(a) plots taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, (b) plots taken from the *Mahābhārata*, the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Purāṇas*, and (c) plots taken probably from the *Bṛhatkathā* of *Guṇāḍhya* and other popular sources.

**Classifica-  
tion of  
Bhāsa's  
dramas**

**Rāmāyaṇa-  
plays**

The *Pratimā* (Nāṭaka) which is the most popular of the *Rāmāyaṇa*-plays, is written in *seven* acts. The story starts from the death of King Daśaratha and ends with Rāma's return to Ayodhyā from Laṅkā. The second play, based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is the *Abhiṣeka* (Nāṭaka) in *six* acts. The subject-matter is the coronation of Rāma.

**Mahābhā-  
rata-plays**

The *Madhyama-vyāyoga* deserves mention first amongst the *Mahābhārata*-plays. This drama (Vyāyoga) in *one* act amply testifies to the skill of the dramatist in depicting characters. The play is based on the tale of Hiḍimbā's love for Bhīma. The *Dūta-ghaṭotkaca* is also a drama (Vyāyoga) in *one* act which describes Ghaṭotkaca appearing before the Kauravas immediately after the death of Abhimanyu, with the news that Arjuna is preparing for their punishment. The *Karṇabhāra* (Vyāyoga) also contains *one* act, the story being how the armour and ear-rings of Karṇa are stolen by Indra. The story of *Ūrubhaṅga* (probably of the *Aṅka* type) in *one* act depicts the fight between Bhīma and Duryodhana ending in the breaking of the latter's thigh. The *Dūtavākya* is also a drama (Vyāyoga) in *one* act where Kṛṣṇa appears as an

ambassador to bring about reconciliation between the contending parties, the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas, and is ill-treated by Duryodhana who tries to entrap him without success. The *Pañcarātra* is a play (Sama-vakāra) in *three* acts. There the story is how Droṇa undertakes a sacrifice for Duryodhana and seeks as fee the grant of half the kingdom to the Pāṇḍavas and Duryodhana promises on the condition that the Pāṇḍavas who were living *incognito*, should be found out within five nights. The *Bālacarita* is a drama (Nāṭaka) in *five* acts depicting the various incidents in the early life of Kṛṣṇa up to the death of Kaiśa. Its plot seems to be derived from the *Harivaṁśa* and the Purāṇas describing Kṛṣṇa's life.

Indian critics claim *Svapnavāsavadatta* to be the best of Bhāsa's dramas where the poet has displayed his skill of characterization and the fine manipulation of the plot which has made the drama interesting up to the last. The play (Nāṭaka) contains *six* acts. The theme of the play is the marriage between Vatsarāja Udayana and Padmāvatī, the sister of King Darśaka, which was effected by Yaugandharāyaṇa, Udayana's minister, to serve a political

**Bṛhatkathā-  
plays**



purpose. To gain the end in view, Yaugandharāyaṇa spread the rumour that Vāsavadattā the former queen of Udayana, had been burnt in a conflagration ; but he actually kept her as a deposit to Padmāvatī. The *Pratijñāyauḡandharāyaṇa* (Nāṭaka) in *four* acts is the prelude to *Śrapnavāsavadatta* which depicts Yaugandharāyaṇa coming to Ujjayinī and causing Vāsavadattā to escape with Udayana who was taken captive by Pradyota Mahāsena while the former was out a-hunting. The *Cārudatta* is an incomplete drama (Prakarāṇa) in *four* acts on which Śūdraka seems to have based his *Mṛcchakaṭīka*. The theme is the love-story of Brāhmaṇa Cārudatta and courtesan Vasantasenā. The material for this drama was taken from popular stories. The *Avimāraka* is a play (Nāṭaka) in *six* acts, having for its theme the union of Princess Kuraṅgī with Prince Viṣṇuṣeṇa *alias* Avimāraka. The plots of all the four dramas are said to have been taken from the *Bṛhatkathā*. and they can be traced to the *Kathāsaritsāgara*.

Śūdraka :  
age and  
authorship

The date and authorship of the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* (Prakarāṇa) in *ten* acts is still a disputed point in the history of Sanskrit

literature.<sup>1</sup> According to some scholars, the drama was written by the poet Daṇḍin who quotes a verse of the *Mr̥cchakaṭika* in his *Kāvvyādarśa*.<sup>2</sup> But the recent discovery of the dramas of Bhāsa shows that the verse is found in the *Cārudatta* and the *Bālacarita* also, and it is highly probable that the drama was written just after the *Cārudatta*, nearly about the first century A.D. It is a point to be noted that though Kālidāsa mentions Bhāsa, Saumilla and Kaviputra, he does not say a word about Śūdraka. In the prologue of the *Mr̥cchakaṭika* the royal author has been described as master of various Śāstras. He performed a horse-sacrifice and in the one hundred and tenth year of his life entered into fire having made over the kingdom to his son. From this it is evident that either this portion of the text is an interpolation or that the real author was some one else. The name

<sup>1</sup> Vāmana is the earliest known writer to quote from the drama of Śūdraka.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Pischel first ascribes this play to Bhāsa and next to Daṇḍin. According to the orthodox tradition, Daṇḍin is the author of three works, the other two being, the *Kāvvyādarśa* and the *Daśakumāracarita*.

of King Śūdraka is found in the *Rājataran-giṇī*, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Skandapurāṇa*. In some of the manuscripts, Śūdraka has been described as a minister of Śālivāhana who subsequently became the ruler of Pratiṣṭhāna. According to Professor Konow, Śūdraka is to be identified with the Ābhira prince, Śivadatta. According to Dr. Fleet, Śūdraka's son Īśvarasena defeated the Andhras and established the Cedi era of 248-49 A.D. The play is a Prakaraṇa in ten acts having the love-story of Cārudatta and Vasantasenā for its theme. It is a social drama with magnificent touches of realism. The characterization is of a high standard. The drama is highly suggestive on account of its simple and dignified style.

#### Kālidāsa

Kālidāsa is acclaimed to be the best of Indian dramatists, whom Goethe has praised in the most fascinating terms. Superb characterization, study of human nature and wonderful mastery over the Sanskrit language have placed him in the forefront of Indian dramatists. Kālidāsa is not verbose like later Sanskrit dramatists, economy being the most remarkable feature of his technique. Though Kālidāsa is pre-eminently a poet of love, he can rise occa-

sionally to a tragic elevation. Every character of Kālidāsa's dramas has a core of personality which is sharply individualized. Though it is said that the dramas of Kālidāsa lacks action to some extent, yet they have a moral purity and a peculiar charm unsurpassed by any other Indian dramatist.

The *Mālavikāgnimitra* (Nāṭaka), undoubtedly an earlier writing of the dramatist, is written in *five* acts. It describes the love-story of Mālavikā and Agnimitra, King of Vidiśā and founder of the Śuṅga dynasty. This drama, unlike the two others, is characterized by quick action. The jester is a veritable rogue and is far more intelligent than the jester in the *Śākuntala*. The female characters and the dancing masters are all productions of really great merit.

**Mālavikāg-  
nimitra**

The second drama, the *Vikramorvaśīya* shows remarkable development over the former in the manipulation of the plot, characterization and language, and there are scholars who think that it is the last of the three dramatic compositions of the poet. The materials for this drama, preserved in two recensions, northern and southern, have been taken from a Saṁvāda-hymn of the *Rgveda*. This drama (Troṭaka) which is

**Vikramor-  
vaśīya**

written in *five* acts, has for its theme the union of the earthly king Purūravas and the celestial nymph Urvaśī. The fourth act of this drama which is a soliloquy of the love-stricken and frenzied Purūravas, is a novel conception of the dramatist.

### Sākuntala

The *Abhijñānaśakuntala* or *Śākuntala* is the production of Kālidāsa's maturer hand, which has gained world-wide recognition and the play has been translated into many European languages. The drama (Nāṭaka) which is in *seven* acts, describes the union of Duṣyanta and Śākuntalā. The plot of this drama has been taken from the *Mahābhārata*, but the dramatist has introduced many noble innovations. The story is also to be found in the *Padmapurāṇa* and the Pāli Jātaka collections. There are *four* different recensions of this drama, viz., Bengal, North-western, Kāshmirian and South Indian. According to Professor Pischel, the Bengal recension fully represents the original.

### Harṣa

Three dramas are ascribed to Harṣa, King of Kānyakubja, who reigned from 606 A.D. to 647 A.D.<sup>1</sup> He was the reputed patron of

<sup>1</sup> It is believed by some scholars that the author

Bāṇabhaṭṭa who has glorified him in his *Harṣacarita*. Harṣa's style is not strictly classical, but his arrangement of plot is fairly satisfactory.

The *Ratnāvalī* is a drama (Nāṭikā) in *four* acts which deals with the story of the union of King Udayana and Ratnāvalī, daughter of the King of Ceylon.

**Ratnāvalī**

The *Priyadarśikā* is also a drama (Nāṭikā) in *four* acts having for its theme the union of Udayana and Priyadarśikā, daughter of King Dṛḍhavarman. In both these dramas we have not only a similarity of subject-matter and form but also a reminiscence of Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra*.

**Priyadarśikā**

The *Nāgānanda* is a drama (Nāṭaka) in *five* acts which describes the self-sacrifice of Jimūtavāhana, Prince of Vidyādhara.

**Nāgānanda**

Mahendravikrama flourished in the first quarter of the seventh century A.D. His *Mattavilāsa* is a farce (Prahasana) which describes the moral degradations of the dramatist's contemporary society.

**Mahendra-  
vikrama  
Mattavilāsa**

Bhavabhūti is the next great name

of these plays was Bāṇa and not Harṣa. Thus Professor Weber attributes *Ratnāvalī* to Bāṇabhaṭṭa while Professors Konow, Winternitz, Lévi and others accept Harṣa's authorship.

**Bhavabhūti**

after Kālidāsa who is mentioned by Kalhaṇa in his *Rājataranginī* as a poet in the court of Yaśovarman, King of Kānyakubja whose probable date is 736 A.D. Vākpati also refers to Bhavabhūti in his *Gauḍavaḥa*. As is evident from the prologue of the *Mālatīmādhava*, Bhavabhūti could not enjoy any popularity in his life-time. Nevertheless, Bhavabhūti displays a masterly skill in characterization, and his language is forceful. Though he is pre-eminent a poet of the Pathetic sentiment, he has excelled his great predecessor in the delineation of the Heroic and the Wonderful. Bhavabhūti is a follower of the Gauḍa style, while Kālidāsa is an advocate of the Vaidarbha. Bhavabhūti amplifies his theme, while Kālidāsa suggests it.

**Mahāvīracarita**

Three dramas are ascribed to Bhavabhūti of which the *Mahāvīracarita* is the earliest. The drama (Nāṭaka) is written in *seven* acts, depicting the heroic achievements of Rāma's early life. The plot is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, but the dramatist has introduced several significant innovations.

**Mālatīmādhava**

The *Mālatīmādhava* is a Prakaraṇa in *ten* acts which deals with the love-story of Mālatī and Mādhava. According to some scholars, it is the latest of all his dramas.

The *Uttararāmacarita* is regarded as the best product of Bhavabhūti's virile pen, where the dramatist has shown his wonderful skill in delineating genuine pathos and describing the sublime and awful aspects of nature. The plot of this drama (Nāṭaka), which is written in *seven* acts, covers the later life of Rāma, beginning from the banishment of Sītā and ending in their happy re-union.

**Uttararā-  
macarita**

The date of Viśākhadatta may be placed somewhere about 860 A.D., as the lunar eclipse mentioned in his drama *Mudrārākṣasa* refers to the phenomenon of that date. The drama (Nāṭaka) is written in *seven* acts. The theme is a political intrigue between Rākṣasa, the minister of the Nandas and Cāṇakya, the great politician, who succeeded in overthrowing the Nandas and winning Rākṣasa to the side of Candragupta. The style of Viśākhadatta marks a distinct falling off from the lucid diction of Kālidāsa and the grandeur of Bhavabhūti. In fact, the style of Viśākhadatta is highly artificial.

**Viśākha-  
datta .  
Mudrā-  
rākṣasa**

Vāmana and Ānandavardhana quote from the work of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa who probably flourished in the eighth century A.D. His only drama (Nāṭaka) *Veṇīśaṁhāra*,

**Bhaṭṭanā-  
rāyaṇa :  
Veṇīśa-  
ṁhāra**



written in *six* acts, is based on the story of the *Mahābhārata*. Bhima kills Duḥśāsana and ties the braid of Draupadī with his blood. Ultimately he succeeds in killing Duryodhana also. Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa is undoubtedly a remarkable craftsman among later Sanskrit dramatists ; he is particularly adept in describing the Heroic sentiment. The first three acts of the *Veṅṣaṁhāra* are full of action, and the predominant emotion is enthusiasm (*utsāha*). The poet has also very successfully illustrated the manifold technicalities of Sanskrit dramaturgy in his drama.

**Murāri :**  
**Anargha-**  
**rāghava**

No other later dramatist was able to dramatize successfully the Rāma-episode, after Bhavabhūti had written his masterpieces. Murāri who is not an exception to this rule, wrote his *Anargharāghava* sometime about the beginning of the ninth century A.D. The drama (Nāṭaka) is written in *seven* acts, and the style is clear.

**Rājaśekhara :**  
**his plays**

Rājaśekhara was the reputed teacher of King Mahendrapāla of Kanauj (893-907 A.D.) Among his many works, Rājaśekhara has written *four* dramas. The *Bālarāmāyaṇa* is a drama (Nāṭaka) in *ten* acts, dealing with the life-history of Rama. The *Bālabhārata* is an incomplete drama (Nāṭaka) of which *two*

acts only are available. The *Karpūramañjarī*, a play (Sattaka) in *four* acts, is written in Prākṛit. The *Viddhaśālabhañjikā* is also a drama (Nāṭikā) in *four* acts. Rājasekhara's style is highly artificial, but the dramatist himself claims to be a great poet.

The *Caṇḍakaśika* of Kṣemīśvara is a drama (Nāṭaka) in *five* acts. The author wrote this play for King Mahipāla of Kanauj whose accession to the throne took place in 914 A.D. The plot of this drama is the famous story of King Hariścandra and sage Viśvāmitra. The style of this drama also is highly artificial.

**Kṣemīś-  
vara :  
Caṇḍa-  
kaśika**

Dāmodaramiśra wrote his *Mahānāṭaka* or *Hanumannāṭaka* in the eleventh century A.D. The drama is found in *three* recensions separately containing *nine, ten* and *fourteen* acts. The plot is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and the dramatist shows considerable skill in versification.

**Dāmodara-  
miśra :  
Mahā-  
nāṭaka**

The date of the *Prabodhacandrodaya*, an allegorical drama, written by Kṛṣṇamiśra is the fourteenth century A.D. The characters of this drama are represented by such characters as Viveka, Manas, Buddhi, etc. This drama is a solitary instance where the Quietistic sentiment has been represented on

**Kṛṣṇa-  
miśra :  
Prabodha-  
candrodaya**

the stage. The drama (Nāṭaka) contains *six* acts, and the style is simple.

## E

### LESS IMPORTANT DRAMAS

*Bhagavadajjukīya* : by Bodhāyanakavi—sometime between the first and the fourth century A.D.—written with the purpose of throwing a fling against Buddhism—a Prahasana in *two* acts.

*Tāpasavatsarājacarita* : by Anaṅgahaṛṣa Mātrarāja—Dr. Keith fixes the age of the *Ratnāvalī* as the upper limit of the work—based on a variation of the theme of Vatsarāja, Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā.

*Lokānanda* : ascribed to Candra or Candraka(?) who is identified with Candragomin, the grammarian, of the seventh century A.D.

*Udāttarāghava* : by Māyurāja who appears to have known Bhavabhūti and is referred to by Rājaśekhara.

*Svapnadaśānana* : by Bhīmaṭa—mentioned by Rājaśekhara.

*Dharmābhhyudaya* : by Meghaprabhācārya—a shadow-drama of unknown date.

*Karṇasundarī* : by Bilhaṇa of the eleventh century A.D.—a Nāṭikā.

- Citrabhārata* : by Kṣemendra of the eleventh century A.D.—a lost drama.
- Prabuddharauhiṇya* : by Rāmabhadra Muni of the twelfth century A.D.—in *six* acts.
- Kaumudīmītrānanda* : by Rāmacandra of the twelfth century A.D.—a Prakaraṇa in *ten* acts.
- Laṭakamelaka* : by Śaṅkhadhara Kavirāja of the twelfth century A.D.—a Prahasana.
- Mudritakumudacandra* : by Yaśaścandra of the twelfth century A.D.—a Jinistic drama.
- Nirbhayaabhīmavyāyoga* : by Rāmacandra, a prolific Jaina dramatist, belonging to the twelfth century A.D.
- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <i>Kirātārjunīya,</i><br><i>Rukmīṇīharṇa,</i><br><i>Triṣṭradūha</i><br><i>Samudramathana</i><br><i>Karpūracarita &amp;</i><br><i>Hāsyacuḍāmaṇi</i> | } | by Vatsarāja of the twelfth century A.D.—the first, a Vyāyoga; the second, an Īhāmṛga in <i>four</i> acts; the third, a Dima in <i>four</i> acts; the fourth, a Samavakāra in <i>three</i> acts, the fifth, a Bhāṇa and the sixth, a farce (Prahasana) <i>one</i> act. |
|--|---|--|
- Pārthaparākrama* : by Prahlādanadeva of the twelfth century A.D.—a Vyāyoga.
- Prasannarūghava* : by Jayadeva (of Berar) of the twelfth century A.D.—based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*—a Nāṭaka in *seven* acts.
- Harakelināṭaka* : by Viśāladeva Vighraharāja of the twelfth century A.D.—partially preserved in stone.
- Kundamālā* : ascribed to Dignāga—but according to some, written by Dhī-

ranāga—quoted in the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*—not later than the thirteenth century A.D.

*Dūtāṅgada* : by Subhaṭa of the thirteenth century A.D.—a shadow-play.

*Hammīramadamardana* : by Jayasinha of the thirteenth century A.D.—in *five* acts.

*Moharājaparājaya* : by Yaśaḥpāla of the thirteenth century A.D.—an allegorical drama in *five* acts.

*Vikrāntakaurava* } by Hastimalla of the thirteenth  
& *Maṭhulikalyāṇa* } : century A.D.—in *six* and *five*  
acts respectively.

*Pūrvatīpariṇaya* : attributed to Bāṇa, but allotted to Vāmana Bhaṭṭa Bāṇa of the fourteenth century A.D.

*Saugandhikūharaṇa* : by Viśvanātha of the fourteenth century A.D.—a Vyāyoga.

*Dhūrtasamūgama* : by Kaviśekhara of the fifteenth century A.D.—a Prahasana.

*Caitanyacandrodaya* : by Kavikarṇapūra of the sixteenth century A.D.

*Vidagdhamādhava* } by Rūpagosvāmin of the six-  
& *Lalitāmādhava* } : teenth century A.D.—dealing  
with the attractive Kṛṣṇa legend  
—in *seven* and *ten* acts respectively.

*Kaṁsavadhā* : by Śeṣakṛṣṇa of the seventeenth century A.D.—in *seven* acts.

*Jānakīpariṇaya* : by Rāmabhadra Dikṣita of the seventeenth century A.D.

*Mallikāmāruta* : by Uddandīn of the seventeenth century A.D.—a Prakaraṇa.

- Abhutadarpaṇa* : by Mahādeva, contemporary of Rāmabhadra—in *ten* acts.
- Hāsyārṇava* by Jagadīśvara of unknown date—a Prahāsana.
- Kautukasarvasva* : by Gopīnātha of unknown date—a Prahāsana.
- Unmattarāghava* : by Bhāskara of unknown date—an *Aṅka*.
- Mūdhavasūdhana* } : by Nṛtyagopāla Kaviratna of  
(and other plays) } the nineteenth century A.D.
- Amaramaṅgala* : by Pañcānana Tarkaratna of the latter half of the nineteenth century A.D. and the first half of the twentieth century A.D.—in *eight* acts.

### REFERENCES

- Ayyar, A. S. P. : Two plays of Bhāsa.
- Barooah, A. : Bhavabhūti—his place in Sanskrit Literature.
- Basu, Chandranath : Śakuntalātattva.
- Basu, Devendranath : Śakuntalāy Nāṭyakalā.
- Belvalkar, S. K. : (i) Origin of Indian Drama (The Calcutta Review, May, 1922).  
(ii) Uttararāmacarita (HOS).
- Bhandarkar, R. G. : Mālatīmādhava.
- Bühler, G. : On the authorship of the Ratnāvalī.  
(IA. Vol. II)
- Chatterjee, Bankim Chandra : Vividhaprabandha.
- Chatterjee, N. : Mṛcchakaṭika : a study.
- Devadhar, C. R. : Plays ascribed to Bhāsa : their authenticity and merits.

- Gajendragadkar, A. B. : The *Veṇīśaṁhāra*—a critical study.
- Kāle, M. R. : (i) *Abhijñānaśakuntala*.  
(ii) *Uttararāmacarita*.
- Keith, A. B. : (i) *The Sanskrit Drama*.  
(ii) *JRAS*. 1909.
- Kulkarni, K. P. : *Sanskrit Drama and Dramatist*.
- Konow, S. : *IA*. Vol. XLIII (on *Viśākhadatta*).
- Konow, S. & Lanmann, C. R. : *Karpūramañjarī* (HOS).
- Lévi, S. : *Le Theatre Indien*.
- Macdonell, A. A. : *A History of Sankrit Literature*.
- Nariman, G. K., & Jackson A. V. W. : *Priyadarśikā*.
- Pishraoti, A. K. : *Bhāsa's works—a criticism*.
- Pusalker, A. D. : *Bhāsa : a study*.
- Rapson, E. : *JRAS*. 1900, (on *Viśākhadatta*).
- Ridgeway : (i) *The Origin of Tragedy*.  
(ii) *Dramas and Dramatic Dances of Non-European Races*.
- Śāstrin, Ashokanath : (i) *Prācīnbhārata Dṛśya-kāvyaotpattir Itihāsa* (*Bhāratavarṣa*, B.S. 1333-34).  
(ii) *Bhāratīyanāṭyer Vedamūlakatā*.  
(iii) *Bharatīyanāṭyer Pracīnatā* (*Māsik Vasumatī*, B.S. 1345-46).  
(iv) *Abhinayadarpaṇa of Nandikeśvara*.
- Śāstrin T. G. : *Bhāsa's works—a critical study*.
- Tagore, Rabindranath : *Prācīn Sāhitya*.
- Vidyābhūṣaṇa, S. C. : *Date of Ratnāvalī*.
- Weber, A. : *The History of Indian Literature*.
- Wilson, H. H. : *Theatre of the Hindus*.
- Winternitz, M. : *Some Problems of Indian Literature*.
- Yajnik, R. K. : *The Indian Theatre*.

## CHAPTER SIX

### LYRIC POETRY

#### A

### INTRODUCTION

Classical Sanskrit literature is highly rich in lyrical poetry. Though it is a fact that Classical lyric poetry has not produced many works of respectable length and size, yet none would deny that its merit is usually of a high order. Lyrical poets have often been successful in depicting the amorous feeling with a few artistic strokes, and their compositions can very well stand comparison with those of foreign poets. The range of lyrical literature in Sanskrit is very wide. It is not confined to the theme of love and amorous feeling only. It includes secular, religious, gnostic and didactic poems and thus offers a variety which is sufficient to remove monotony.

**Extent of  
Sanskrit  
lyrics**

In all lyrical poems dealing with love, Nature plays a very important part. The intimate relation between Nature and Man has not in all probability found a more charming expression in any other branch of

**Nature in  
Sanskrit  
lyrics**



literature. The lotus and the lily, the Cakora the Cakravāka and the Cātaka, all are inseparably connected with human life and love in its different phases.

**Prākṛit  
lyrics**

It is further to be noted that Prākṛit literature is also highly rich in lyrical poetry. The *Sattasai* or *Gāthāsaptasatī* attributed to Sātavāhana is an outstanding work of this type. The book is a collection of *seven hundred* verses in Prākṛit dealing with various phases of the sentiment of love. Bāṇa refers to this work in his *Harṣacarita*. Professor Macdonell wants to place it before 1000 A.D. If, on the other hand, Hāla or Sātavāhana, to whom the work is attributed, is taken as a king of that name of the Andhra dynasty, the work must be placed early in the Christian era.

## B

### GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT OF LYRIC POETRY

**Meghadūta**

The name of Kālidāsa stands high in the realm of Sanskrit lyrical poetry. There is no gainsaying the fact that his *Meghadūta* which has been unsuccessfully imitated

times without number by later poets,<sup>1</sup> is the finest flower of Classical lyric poetry. The lyric has inspired poets like Goethe and Rabindranath who have lavishly bestowed their praise upon this magic personality in literature. Fancifully the poet makes a cloud the messenger of the message of love and admiration to the beloved of a banished Yakṣa, who had been pining for him during the rainy season at Alakā. The work is divided into *two* sections known as the *Pūrvamegha* and the *Uttaramegha*. The poem is written in Mandākrāntā metre of gorgeous rhythm like the roar of a July cloud weary under the burden of its water. This is also quite in keeping with the sublime conception of love which, tinged with the burning colour of separation, resembles a black cloud with a silver lining. The stanzas containing the words of message are the most poignant and beautiful in literature and the lyric will ever stand impressed on our memory like a rainbow springing from the earth.

<sup>1</sup> Vedāntadeśika's *Haṁsasandēśa* (of the thirteenth century A.D.) Rūpagosvāmin's *Haṁsadūta* (of the fifteenth century A.D.) Kṛṣṇānanda's *Padāṅkadūta* (of the seventeenth century A.D.) are some of the more well-known Dūtakāvya.

The book has been translated into various European languages and Schiller's *Maria Stuart* owes its origin to it.

**Ṛtusamhāra**

The *Ṛtusamhāra* is the second lyric of Kālidāsa. It is a short poem in *six* cantos describing all the six seasons of the year. It is undoubtedly an earlier production of the poet and though Kālidāsa's authorship of this poem is doubted by many scholars,<sup>1</sup> still we can find in it the aspirations of a budding poet.<sup>2</sup>

**Ghaṭa-  
karpara :  
Ghaṭakar-  
para-kāvya**

Tradition makes Ghaṭakarpara one of the nine gems in the court of King Vikramāditya. The *Ghaṭakarpara-kāvya* after the name of the poet is written in *twenty-two* stanzas. It describes how a young wife in the beginning of the rains sends a cloud-messenger to her absent husband. The poem abounds in Yamakas (figure of speech) for which the author feels proud.

**Bhartṛhari :  
three  
Śatakas**

Bhartṛhari has to his credit the *three* Śatakas (collection of a hundred verses), viz., (a) the *Śṛṅgāraśataka* (b) the *Nītiśataka*

<sup>1</sup> Professors Kielhorn, Bühler, Macdonell, Schroeder and others accept the authorship of Kālidāsa while other scholars entertain a different view.

<sup>2</sup> See, Aurobinda Ghosh, Kālidāsa ; Gajendragadkar *Ṛtusamhāra*.

and (c) the *Vairāgyaśataka*. The single authorship of these three poems is doubted by some scholars, but Indian tradition accepts Bhartṛhari to be their author. Bhartṛhari is said to have died in 651 A.D.<sup>1</sup> All the three poems are written in a very lucid style, and they have the greatest interest to them for whom they are intended.

Mayūra was a contemporary of Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa of the seventh century A.D., and reported to be his father-in-law. His *Sūryaśataka*<sup>2</sup> is a religious lyric in *one hundred* verses written in honour of the Sun. Tradition says that the poet was cured of leprosy by composing this eulogy of the Sun.<sup>3</sup>

**Mayūra :**  
**Sūryaśataka**

It is impossible to ascertain the date of Amaru. Vāmana (800 A.D.) is the earliest writer who quotes three verses from the *Amaruśataka*, a lyrical poem in *one hundred*

**Amaru :**  
**Amaru-**  
**śataka**

<sup>1</sup> It is yet to be decided whether the author of the Śatakas is the same person as the famous grammarian of that name who wrote the *Vākyapadīya*.

<sup>2</sup> There are other *Sūryaśatakas* by different poets which do not deserve any special mention.

<sup>3</sup> Vajradatta, a Buddhist poet of the ninth century A.D. composed his *Lokeśvaraśataka* and was cured of leprosy.

stanzas<sup>1</sup> describing the conditions of women at different stages of life and love. The poet is really gifted and his delineation of sentiments and emotions, especially of love, is superb in character. His style is difficult, but certainly graceful. Amaru's poem has found the widest recognition in the hands of Sanskrit rhetoricians and he is quoted by great thinkers on poetry like Ānandavardhana. The poem has been commented on by more than a dozen writers including Arjunavarman (1215 A.D.).

**Bilhana :**  
**Caurapañ-**  
**cāsikā**

The *Caurapañcāsikā* of Bilhana is a lover's recollections of the sweet company of his beloved. The poem contains *fifty* stanzas. The date of the poet is 1076 A.D.—1127 A.D. Bhāratacandra, a Bengali poet of the eighteenth century A.D., drew the inspiration of his popular poem '*Vidyāsundara*' from this work of Bilhana.

**Jayadeva :**  
**Gītagovinda**

The Kṛṣṇa-legend found a poetical interpreter in Jayadeva, the last great name in Sanskrit poetry, who flourished in Bengal during the reign of King Lakṣmaṇasena of the twelfth century A.D. He was the son of Bhojadeva of Kendubilva. His poem, the

<sup>1</sup> The text of the poem has come down to us in *four* recensions which vary widely among themselves.

*Gitagovinda*, ranks high amongst Sanskrit lyrics, and the poet is a gifted master of poetry. According to Professor Macdonell the poem marks a transitional period between pure lyric and pure drama.<sup>1</sup> Sir William Jones calls it a small pastoral drama while Professor Lassen regards it as a lyrical drama. Leopold von Schroeder would look upon it as a refined Yātrā. Both Professors Pischel and Lévi place it in the category between song and drama. Some Indian scholars maintain that the poem is a court-epic.

Dhoyī, a contemporary of Jayadeva, graced the court of King Lakṣaṇasena. Like other Dūtakāvyas, his poem, the *Pavanadūta*, is written in imitation of the *Meghadūta*.

**Dhoyī :  
Pavanadūta**

## C

### LESSER LYRIC POEMS AND ANTHOLOGIES

*Śṛṅgāratilaka* : attributed to Kālidāsa—containing attractive pictures of love in twenty-three stanzas.

*Bhaktāmarastotra* : by Mānatuṅga, probably a contemporary of Bāṇa or earlier—

<sup>1</sup>It is probable that the poet took as his model popular plays representing incidents from the life of Kṛṣṇa as the modern Yātrās in Bengal still do.

written in honour of the Jaina saint Rṣabha in *forty-four* verses.

*Kalyāṇamandirastotra* : by Siddhasena Divākara, probably of the seventh century A.D. —written in imitation of Mānātūṅga—containing *forty-four* stanzas.

*Suprabhātastotra* and *Aṣṭamahāśrīcaityastotra* } : by King Harṣavardhana —the first being a morning hymn in *twenty-four* verses in praise of Buddha and the second, a hymn in *five* verses in praise of the eight great shrines.

*Caṇḍīśataka* : by Bāṇabhaṭṭa of the seventh century A.D.—a collection of *one hundred and two* verses written in honour of the goddess Pārvatī.

*Sragdharāstotra* : by Sarvajñamitra, a Buddhist of the eighth century A.D.—dedicated to Tārā, the Buddhist goddess—containing *thirty-seven* stanzas.

*Kuṭṭanīmata* : by Dāmodaragupta, minister of King Jayāpīḍa of Kāshmir of 772 A.D.—813 A.D.—an erotic poem.

*Ānandalahari* or *Saundaryalaharī* & *Mohamudgāra* } : attributed to Śaṅkara, the great teacher of monistic Vedānta.

*Devīśataka* : by Ānandavardhana, the famous rhetorician of the ninth century A.D.

*Bhallaṭa-śataka* : by Bhallaṭa, a junior contemporary of Ānandavardhana—a gnostic poem.

*Mahimnaḥstotra* : by Puṣpadanta, not later than the ninth century A. D.—a religious lyric.

*Subhāṣitaratnasandoha* ) by Amitagati of the tenth  
*Dharmaparīkṣū* & ) century A.D.—all didactic  
*Yogasāra* ) poems.

*Kṛṣṇakarmūṛta* ) by Bilvamaṅgala or Līlāśuka of  
 & *Vṛndāvanastuti* ) the eleventh century A.D.—  
 highly popular and of graceful style.

*Samayamāṭrkā*,  
*Kalāvīlāsa*, *Darpadalana*, } by Kṣemendra of Kāsh-  
*Sevyasevakopadeśa*, } : mir—all didactic poems.  
*Caturvargaśaṅgraha* &  
*Cārucaryūśataka* }

*Kaṇḍavacanasaṃuccaya* : an anthology—of the eleventh century A.D.

*Anyoktimuktālatāśataka* : by Śambhu who wrote under Harṣa of Kāshmir (1089 A.D.—1101 A.D.)—a gnostic poem.

*Āryāṣaṭaśatī* : by Govardhana, a contemporary of Jayadeva—containing seven hundred erotic stanzas—written after the *Sattasaī* of Hāla.

*Yogaśūtra*  
*Vitarāgaśtōtra* & } by Hemacandra of the  
*Mahāvīraśtōtra* } : twelfth century A.D.—very  
 good didactic lyric poems,  
 sometimes reminding us  
 of the poems of Bhartṛhari.

*Saduktikarmūṛta* : an anthology by Śrīdhara of the twelfth century A.D.



*Śāntiśataka* : by Śilhaṇa, of Kāshmir who lived before 1205 A.D.—written in the style of Bhartṛhari's poems.

*Bhaktiśataka* : by Rāmacandra of Bengal who came to Ceylon with King Parīkramabāhu (thirteenth century A.D.)

*Śṛṅgāravararūgyatarāṅgi* : by Somaprabha of the thirteenth century A.D.—a didactic poem in *forty-six* stanzas written in perfect Kāvya style.

*Subhāṣitamuktāvalī* : an anthology by Jalhaṇa of the thirteenth century A.D.

*Śūraṅgadharapaddhati* : an anthology by Śūraṅgadhara of the fourteenth century A.D.

*Subhāṣitāvalī* : an anthology by Śrīvara of the fifteenth century A.D.

*Bhūminīvilāsa* } : by Jagannātha, the famous rhetorician of the seventeenth century A.D.  
& *Gaṅgālaharī* }

[N. B. Names of some lyrical poetesses and their stray verses are found in some anthologies. The more important among them are Śilabhaṭṭārikā, Vijjakā, Vikāṭanitamā, Priyamvadā etc., etc.]

## REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Krishnamachariar, M. : Classical Sanskrit Literature.

Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.

# CHAPTER SEVEN

## HISTORICAL WRITINGS

### A

### INTRODUCTION

Nobody denies the antiquity and greatness of Indian civilization but it is rather unfortunate that in the wide range of early or medieval Sanskrit literature, one seldom comes across a useful work of history. The paucity of authoritative historical books bewilders all students of Classical Sanskrit literature, and it is a pity that India has failed to produce even one outstanding historian noted for his critical insight and scientific presentation of facts. It is, however, admitted on all hands that Kalhaṇa is the most successful of all Indian historians and that the history of Kāshmir would have remained obscure without his immortal work, the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. But even Kalhaṇa's writings are not without exaggerated and confusing statements, and poetic fancy has often been allowed to dominate the genuine spirit of a historian. The causes of the paucity of historical works may be traced to the peculiarities of Indian psycho-

**Paucity of  
Historical  
works :  
causes**

logy aided by environment and the course of events. The popular Indian view on worldly life and the teachings of Indian philosophical and religious works are surely responsible for fostering a feeling of apathy towards making any serious attempt at recording facts and dwelling on them.

**Earliest  
Historical  
works**

The beginnings of Indian history are to be traced to the Purāṇas which contain amidst vast masses of religious and social matters, accounts of genealogies which are the very germs of history.

**Vākpati :  
Gauḍavaho**

In Prākṛit, however, there is a very important historical work called the *Gauḍavaho* which was written by Vākpati. It celebrates the defeat of one Gauḍa king by Yaśovarman, King of Kanauj, the poet's patron, who was again overthrown by Lalitāditya Muk-tāpīḍa, King of Kāshmir. Vākpati is a follower of the Gauḍa style and uses long compounds. His date has approximately been fixed in the eighth century A.D., and he is mentioned along with Bhavabhūti.

## B

### GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORICAL WORKS

Padmagupta also known as Parimala, wrote his *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* in 1050

A.D. The book contains *eighteen* cantos and describes the winning of Princess Śaśiprabhā and also alludes to the history of Sindhurāja Navasāhasāṅka of Mālava.

**Padma-  
gupta :  
Navasāha-  
sāṅkacarita**

Sandhyākaranandin's *Rāmapālacarita* describes through *double entendre* the story of Rāma and also the history of King Rāmapāla of Bengal who recovered his ancestral home from Bhīma, a Kaivarta chief, and conquered Mithilā. Sandhyākaranandin flourished during 1057 A.D.—1087 A.D.

**Sandhyā-  
karanan-  
din : Rāma-  
pālacarita**

Bilhaṇa's patron was Vikramāditya VI, a Cālukya king of Kalyāṇa who flourished during 1076 A.D.—1127 A.D. Bilhaṇa glorified his patron by writing his *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* in *eighteen* cantos. Bilhaṇa was more a poet than a historian and his work abounds in numerous imaginary and fanciful descriptions.

**Bilhaṇa :  
Vikramāṅ-  
kadeva-  
carita**

Kalhaṇa is the best of Indian historians. He wrote his *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* in 1100 A.D. Kalhaṇa has derived materials for his book from older sources including the *Nīlmatapurāṇa*. The *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* is the only reliable book on the history of Kāshmir after the death of King Harṣa when the country passed through stormy bloody days. Though a historian, Kalhaṇa has the rare

**Kalhaṇa :  
Rājatarā-  
ṅgiṇī**

gifts of a poet, and his book is a wonderful admixture of poetic fancy and historical facts. According to European scholars, it is the only work in Sanskrit literature which approaches history to a certain extent.

**Hema-  
candra ·  
Kumāra-  
pālacarita**

Hemacandra who flourished during 1088 A.D.—1172 A.D. wrote his *Kumārapālacarita* or *Dvyāśrayakāvya* in honour of Kumārapāla, King of the Cālukyas.

**Pr̥thvirāja-  
vijaya**

The anonymous *Pr̥thvirājavijaya* celebrates the victories of King Pr̥thvirāja over Shihāb-ud-din Ghori in 1191 A.D.

## C

### MINOR HISTORICAL WORKS

*Prabhāvākacaritra* : by Prabhācandra and revised by Pradyumnasūri (1277 A.D.)—regarded as a continuation of Hemacandra's *Parīśiṣṭa-parvaṇ*—containing the life-history of twenty-two Jaina teachers—a semi-historical work.

*Rājendrakarṇapūra* : by Śambhu who wrote in honour of Harṣadeva of Kāshmir (1089 A.D.—1101 A.D.)

*Kīrtikaumudī* } : by Someśvaradatta (1179 A.D.—  
& *Surathotsava* } 1262 A.D.)—more in the form of  
panegyrics—the latter, written in  
*fifteen* cantos.

- Sukṛtasāṅkīrtana* : by Arisimha of the thirteenth century A.D.—a panegyric in eleven cantos.
- Jagadūcarita* : by Sarvānanda of unknown date—a panegyric of a Jaina who rendered help to his townsfolk at the time of the famine of 1256-8 A.D. in Gujarāt.
- Prabandhacintāmaṇi* : by Merutuṅga of the fourteenth century A.D.—a quasi-historical-biographical work.
- Prabandhakośa* : by Rājaśekhara of the fourteenth century A.D.—containing the life-stories of Jaina teachers, poets, kings and other personages.
- Kīrtilatā* : by Vidyāpati of the fourteenth century A.D.

## REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
 Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
 Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.  
 Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature,  
 Vol. II.
-

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### PROSE LITERATURE

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

In matters of expression the Indian mind has always preferred poetry to prose. Commentaries and lexicons were written in verse, and sometimes conversation even was carried on in metre. The major portion of Vedic literature is in metre. So the peculiarity of the Indian mind is the cause of the dearth of prose literature in Sanskrit. In the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*, however, we come across the earliest specimen of prose-writing. The prose of the *Atharvaveda* should also be considered in connection with the study of the history and development of prose-writings in ancient India. The prose of the Brāhmaṇas is simple yet elegant, and the prose of the Sūkta literature is more or less in the form of a message we usually send in a telegram. All these, however, cannot give us any standard of writing which may be imitated with profit. The prose portions of the *Mahābhārata*, and of the Pūraṇas such as, the *Viṣṇu* and the

*Bhāgavata*, and of the medical compilations of Caraka and Suśruta should also be mentioned. The earliest standard of prose-writing is to be found in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* which is noted for its grace, vigour and elegance, and in it we find a perfection of Brāhmaṇical prose. The prose of explanatory treatises or commentaries offers a good specimen of Sanskrit composition. Thus the writings of Śābarasvāmin on the *Mīmāṃsā-sūtras*, of Vātsyāyana on the *Nyāyasūtras* the commentaries of Śaṅkara on the *Brahmasūtras* and the Upaniṣads and the explanatory work of Medhātithi on *Manu-smṛti* are instances to the point. Besides all these, there is the prose of the early dramatic literature which should necessarily demand a careful study. In fact, the extent of prose-writing is not very small, but when it is said that it is insignificant, the greater extent of poetic compositions is considered.

Though the beginnings of Sanskrit prose-writings may be traced to a very dim antiquity, the extant works on prose literature are of a comparatively late date. The extant prose literature may be divided into *two* broad classes :—romance and fable.

It appears that in early Classical Sans-

**Romance &  
Fable**



**Ākhyāyikā  
& Kathā**

krit there were numerous types of prose romances, the two most important among them being Ākhyāyikā and Kathā. But as early as the seventh century A.D., Daṇḍin writes in his *Kāvyādarśa* that there is no vital point of difference in the nature of these two types of prose compositions and he regards them as the different names of one and the same species. Amarasimha, the lexicographer, however, distinguishes between the two, Ākhyāyikā having a historical basis and Kathā being a purely poetic creation.

**Origin of  
Fable  
literature**

The origin of Indian fable literature must be traced back to the earliest times in the life of Vedic Indians. The tales current among the people were later on used for a definite purpose, and the didactic fable became a mode of inculcating useful knowledge.

## B

### ROMANCE

**Daṇḍin :  
age & home**

There is a great difference of opinion amongst scholars regarding the age of Daṇḍin. It is held on the evidence of the *Kāvyādarśa*, a well-known work on rhetorical

canons by the poet, that he flourished after Pravarasena. According to the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, Pravarasena ruled Kāshmir in the sixth century A.D. This Pravarasena was probably the author of the poem *Setubandha*. The relation between Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, another rhetorician, has created a great controversy. Some scholars are inclined to believe that Daṇḍin has criticized the views of Bhāmaha while others entertain the opposite view. There is some controversy again with regard to the relation of Daṇḍin to Bhaṭṭi, the grammarian-poet. Some scholars are definitely of opinion that Daṇḍin used the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*. It is, however, presumed that he flourished in the seventh century A.D. From the internal evidence furnished by both the *Daśakumāracarita* and the *Kāvyaadarśa*, it appears that Daṇḍin was an inhabitant of South India. He was fairly acquainted with the Kāverī, the Andhras and the Colas.

Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita*, a work of the Akhyāyikā type, describes the exploits of eight princes, Rājavāhana and others. As the name of the work implies, it should have contained accounts of ten princes. The stories of the other two princes are given in

**Daśakumāracarita :**  
**contents &**  
**character**

the prelude (*Pūrvapīṭhikā*), and the incomplete story of one of the princes (*Viśruta*) has been incorporated in the sequel (*Uttarapīṭhikā*), which two chapters seem to be the work of a different hand. The romance reflects admirably the social conditions in which the author lived and where the standard of morality was markedly poor. Daṇḍin's writings usually conform to the Vaidarbha style.

**Subandhu :  
age & work**

Subandhu appears to have been earlier than Bāṇabhaṭṭa who has referred to the former's *Vāsavadattā* in his introduction to the *Kādambarī*. In a passage in the *Vāsavadattā* Subandhu laments over the death of Vikramāditya. This has led scholars to surmise that after the death of Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty, who assumed the title of Vikramāditya, there was a civil war in the country, and Subandhu was aggrieved by upholding the losing cause. This theory, however, is not generally accepted. From two passages in the *Vāsavadattā*, European scholars find references to Uddyotakara, the great writer on Nyāya, and the *Bauddhasaṅgatya laṅkāra* of Dharmakīrti. If the allusions are correct, Subandhu may be placed in the beginning of the seventh century A.D.

**Story of  
Vāsavadattā**

The theme of Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā* is the love-story of Prince Kandarpaketu and Princess Vāsavadattā. The playful imagination of the poet conceives how on one night, the prince dreams about a beautiful princess and starts in quest of her. Meanwhile, the princess having dreamt of Prince Kandarpaketu sends one of her personal attendants in search of him. Kandarpaketu in course of his travels comes to learn about Vāsavadattā from the conversation of a pair of birds. He arrives at Pāṭaliputra and is united with Vāsavadattā. But the king, Vāsavadattā's father, wants to give her away to another prince. Thereupon the two leave the palace on a magic steed and go to the Vindhya. One night they fall asleep but in the morning the prince gets up and is surprised not to find Vāsavadattā by his side. He commences a vigorous search and at last discovers her in the hermitage of the sage. She is turned into a stone, and the prince revives her by his touch.

**Style**

The poet is a master of a style which is marked by a preponderant use of alliteration.

Bāṇabhaṭṭa is undoubtedly the greatest of Indian prose-writers. Fortunately, the

**Bāṇa :**  
**age &**  
**works**

date of Bāṇa is one of the surest planks in the tottering edifice of ancient Indian chronology. Bāṇa has to his credit the *Harṣacarita* and the *Kādambarī* which are respectively an Akhyāyikā and a Kathā.

**Harṣa-**  
**carita**

In his *Harṣacarita*, Bāṇa glorifies his patron, King Harṣa who flourished during 606 A.D.-647 A.D. In the first and second chapters of this incomplete book Bāṇa gives an account of his genealogy and early life which reveals him as a great traveller.

**Kādambarī**

Bāṇa makes lavish use of his poetic imagination in relating the story of *Kādambarī* which also he could not complete. The theme of this book is the fascinating love-story of Candrāpiḍa and Kādambarī in their several births. Running parallel with the main story we also find the love-episode of Puṇḍarika and Mahāśvetā. The romance relates how the Moon-god being cursed by Puṇḍarika who was pining for Mahāśveta, was born on earth as Candrāpiḍa and fell in love with Kādambarī, the Gandharva princess. Puṇḍarika also cursed by the Moon-god was born on earth as Vaiśampāyana, the friend of Candrāpiḍa. In this birth also both Candrāpiḍa and Vaiśampāyana gave up their lives and were again born as King

Śūdraka and the parrot respectively. Happily in this birth they were all reunited.

Much has been said of Bāṇa's style. Western critics describe it as a big forest where all access is prohibited because of the luxuriant undergrowth of words. But Indian scholars have the highest admiration for Bāṇa and his style, and it would not be an exaggeration to say that his style has been regarded by Indian scholars as the standard style of prose. Superb is Bāṇa's power of description and he wields the language with the greatest ease.

**Style**

## C

### FABLE

The short stories in Indian literature may be classed under *three* different heads, viz., the popular tales, the beast-fables and the fairy tales. The popular tales again may be broadly sub-divided into Buddhistic and non-Buddhistic.<sup>1</sup>

**Classifica-  
tion of  
fables**

The Buddhist popular tales are the Pāli Jātakas which were current among the

**Buddhist  
popular  
tales**

<sup>1</sup> The fable literature of the Jainas is extremely rich. But only a few works are written in pure Sanskrit.

Buddhists from the earliest times. Apart from these Jātaka stories there are some Buddhist Sanskrit works on popular stories (already referred to in a previous chapter).

'Guṇāḍhya's  
Bṛhatkathā  
& works  
based on it

Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛhatkathā* is an outstanding work among non-Buddhistic popular tales. The work was written in Paisāci Prākṛit, a dialect spoken in the north western parts of India. The work is now unfortunately lost to us, but the story has been preserved in *three* Sanskrit works, viz., (1) Budhasvāmin's *Ślokaśaṅgraha* (composed between the eighth and the ninth century A.D.), (2) Kṣemendra's *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (1037 A.D.) and (3) Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* (1063-81 A.D.). According to Dr. Keith the *Ślokaśaṅgraha* (which is found only in a fragment of *twenty-eight* chapters and some 4539 verses) is a genuine translation of Guṇāḍhya's work and he holds that both Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* (containing 21,388 verses) and Kṣemendra's *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (containing about 7500 verses) are not from the original *Bṛhatkathā*. Nevertheless, the *Bṛhatkathā* is mentioned as early as the seventh century A.D. in Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*, and Dr. Bühler has placed the

work in the first or the second century A.D. Dr. Keith suggests that it was written not later than the fourth century A.D. The importance of the *Bṛhatkathā* can never be over-estimated. As a perpetual source of inspiration the *Bṛhatkathā* occupies in ancient Indian literature, a place next only to that of the two Great Epics, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*.

The *Pañcatantra* by Viṣṇuśarman is an important work on the beast-fable literature and it is said that the book has an earlier basis called the *Tantrākhyāyikā* now lost to us. The work is written in *five* books in clear lucid style with an admixture of prose and verse. It alludes to Cāṇakya and follows Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*. The importance of this work may be judged from the fact that it was translated into Pahlavi and Syriac in the sixth century A.D., into Arabic in the eighth century A.D., into Hebrew in the eleventh century A.D., into Spanish in the thirteenth century A.D., and into Latin and English in the sixteenth century A.D.

The *Hitopadeśa* is another work on beast-fable literature written by one Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita. The author imitates the style of Viṣṇuśarman and the method of arrange-

Viṣṇu-  
śarman :  
Pañca-  
tantra

Nārāyaṇa :  
Hitopadeśa



ment is entirely the same in both the works. The author lived in the court of King Dhavalacandra of whom we know little. A manuscript of this work is dated the fourteenth century A.D. According to Dr. Keith its date cannot be earlier than the eleventh century A.D., as a verse of Rudrabhaṭṭa is cited in the book. Moreover a Jaina scholar made use of it in 1199 A.D. in order to produce a new version.

Another work of the beast-fable class is Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka* written in the fifteenth century A.D.

Śrīvara .  
Kathā-  
kautuka

Under the fairy-tale literature we may class the following three books of unknown date. The *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* attributed to Śivadāsa and the *Siṃhāsanaadvātriṃśikā* are probably of the Buddhist origin. Both the books are based on the character of a fictitious king named Vikrama. The *Śukasaptati* of unknown origin and date is a collection of *seventy* tales which the parrot narrates to the mistress who was about to play false to her husband.

Vetālapañ-  
caviṃśati,  
Siṃhāsana-  
dvātriṃśikā  
& Śuka-  
saptati

## D

## LESSER PROSE TALES

- Upamitibhavaprapaṇcū kathā* : by Siddha or Siddharṣi, a Jaina monk, of 906 A.D.—written in prose interspersed with verses—a didactic tale.
- Kathārṇava* : by Śivadāsa—containing *thirty-five* tales chiefly of fools and thieves—of unknown date but appearing as a late work.
- Puruṣaparīkṣā* : by Vidyāpati belonging to the latter part of the fourteenth century A.D.—containing *forty-four* stories.
- Bhojaprabandha* : by Ballālasena of the sixteenth century A.D.—containing legends of the court of King Bhoja.
- Campakaśreṣṭhīkathānaka* } : by Jinakīrti of the  
*& Pālagopālakathānaka* } : fifteenth century A.D.
- Kathākośa* : of unknown date—written in bad Sanskrit.
- Samyaktvakaumudī* : by an unknown author—probably of a later date.

## REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.
- Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.
- Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.

## CHAPTER NINE

### CAMPŪ LITERATURE

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

**Campū :**  
**character**  
**& age**

Composition in mixed prose and verse in Sanskrit is called Campū. Though the admixture of prose and verse can be traced even in Vedic literature, specially in the Brāhmaṇas, still the origin of Campū is to be sought in its immediate predecessors, the fables and the romances. Already in the writings of Subandhu and Bāṇa and in some inscriptions we find stray verses, until very lately the mingling of prose and verse became a singular characteristic of a different section of literature. But it is a curious fact that no Campū older than the tenth century A.D. is extant, though Professor Oldenberg has discovered something like Campū in the *Jātakamālā* of Āryasūra.

#### B

#### SOME IMPORTANT WORKS

*Nalacampū* & *Madālasācampū* } by Trivikramabhaṭṭa of the tenth century A.D.

- Yaśastilaka* : by Somadeva, a Digambara Jaina, of the middle of the tenth century A.D.—describing the conversion of King Māridatta.
- Tilakamañjarī* : by Dhanapāla, a Jaina, who wrote about 970 A.D.
- Jīvanlharacampū* : by Haricandra, not earlier than 900 A.D.
- Rāmāyaṇacampū* : attributed to Bhojarāja and Lakṣaṇabhaṭṭa.
- Bhūratacampū* : by Ananta of unknown date.
- Udayasundarikathā* : by Soḍḍhala of 1040 A.D.—highly influenced by Bāṇa.
- Gopālacampū* : by Jīvagosvāmin of the sixteenth century A.D.
- Svāhāsudhākaracampū* : by Nārāyaṇa of the seventeenth century A.D.
- Śaṅkaracetovilāsacampū* : by Śaṅkara—a very late work.

### REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.
- Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature, Vol. II.
-

# CHAPTER TEN

## GRAMMAR

### A

## INTRODUCTION

#### Importance of Sanskrit grammar

Grammar is one of the most important branches of Sanskrit literature. From very early times till most recently, grammar has held a unique place, and its study has been continued through centuries with deepest reverence and consummate application. Patañjali, the author of the *Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya*, has dwelt at length on the various uses of the study of grammar. It is a fact that grammar as a branch of literature had a peculiar appeal to the early Indians, and it is worthy of notice that it is in India alone that the study of grammar has ultimately led to the discovery of a system of philosophy.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The high degree of popularity enjoyed by Sanskrit grammar is corroborated by the existence of nearly a dozen schools of grammar each of which is represented by writers of established reputation and following. Indra is, however, mentioned in the *Taittirīyasaṃhitā* as the first of grammarians. The *Kathāsaritsāgara*

The most popular of all the schools of grammar is that of Pāṇini who has mentioned no less than *sixty-four* names of previous grammarians among which Kāśyapa, Āpiśali, Gārgya, Gālava, Śākaṭāyana, Senaka and Sphoṭāyana may be cited.

**Pāṇini &  
his prede-  
cessors**

B,

### PĀṆINI SCHOOL

Scholars vary widely among themselves in determining the age of Pāṇini. Professor Goldstücker places him in the eighth century B.C., while Professors Max Müller and Weber are of opinion that he belonged to the fourth century B.C. His grammar, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, is a work in *eight* chapters each of which contains *four* sections. The arrangement of the rules is highly scientific, economy being the most outstanding characteristic.

**Pāṇini :  
Aṣṭādhyāyī**

informs us that the Aindra school was supplanted by Pāṇini, the author of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This has led Dr. Burnell to conclude that the Aindra school of grammar is the oldest in India. It should be noted, however, that neither Pāṇini nor Patañjali mentions Indra as a grammarian. It is, therefore, argued by some that the Aindra school is post-Pāṇiniya in date, though pre-Pāṇiniya in substance.

**Kātyāyana :**  
**Vārttika**

Kātyāyana who is known as the Vārttikakāra came after Pāṇini and his age is usually assigned to the third century B.C. The Vārttikas are undoubtedly 'supplementary rules' which were framed by Kātyāyana to justify certain new forms which crept into the language after Pāṇini had written his Sūtras. But Kātyāyana did not only supplement the rules of Pāṇini but also rejected some of them which were deemed unnecessary. In some cases again he improved upon the text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* to meet the demands of a living language.

**Patañjali :**  
**Mahābhā-**  
**ṣya :**  
**150 B.C.**

Patañjali who is regarded as the last of the 'three great sages', lived during the reign of King Puṣyamitra (or Puṣpanitra) of the Śuṅga dynasty. His date is one of the few definite landmarks in the whole range of early Indian literature. Patañjali earned for himself a rare reputation and his views were referred to by later schools of rival philosophers with utmost respect and reverence. Patañjali resorted to some technical devices whereby he could effectively extend the scope of the original Sūtras of Pāṇini and did not on that account venture any addition like Kātyāyana. It must, however, be said that he, too, rejected quite a good

number of the Sūtras of Pāṇini. The prose of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, is inimitable and marked by the qualities of grace, brevity and perspicuity.

Next after the three great sages mentioned above, one must remember the name of Bhartṛhari who is often wrongly identified with Bhaṭṭi, the grammarian-poet, and who is in all probability referred to by I-tsing when he says that a great grammarian died in 651 A.D. Bhartṛhari is known as the author of the *Vākyapadīya* (in *two* chapters), the *Prakīrṇa* and a commentary on Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, fragments of which are preserved in the Berlin library. It may be proved on the strength of the internal evidence furnished by the *Vākyapadīya* that the grammarian lived earlier than the seventh century A.D. The opening chapter of the *Vākyapadīya* discusses the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar. In the second chapter and the *Prakīrṇa*, he discusses various topics of Sanskrit grammar.

Vāmana and Jayāditya are the two Buddhist writers who wrote the *Kāśikā*, a commentary on the Sūtras of Pāṇini. I-tsing informs us that Jayāditya died about

**Bhartṛhari  
Vākya-  
padīya and  
other works**

**Vāmana &  
Jayāditya :  
Kāśikā**



660 A.D. The object of Vāmana and Jayāditya was to incorporate in the system of Pāṇini all the improvements made by Candragomin. The *Kāśikā* is usually known as the *Vṛtti*.

**Jinendra-  
buddhi :**  
**Nyāsa**

Jinendrabuddhi, a Bengali Buddhist, wrote an excellent and exhaustive commentary called the *Nyāsa* or the *Kāśikāvivarāṇa-pañjikā*, on the *Kāśikā* of Vāmana and Jayāditya. Jinendrabuddhi is referred to by Bhāmaha, the rhetorician, and as such he cannot be later than the eighth century A.D.

**Kaiyaṭa :**  
**Pradīpa**

Kaiyaṭa is one of the most authoritative writers affiliated to the school of Pāṇini. His commentary, the *Pradīpa*, on the *Mahā-bhāṣya* of Patañjali, is an invaluable treatise. It is believed that Kaiyaṭa wrote in the eleventh century A.D.

**Haradatta :**  
**Paḍa-  
mañjarī**

Haradatta, the author of the *Paḍa-mañjarī*, a commentary of the *Kāśikā*, is well-known for his independent views which more often than not contradict the statements of Patañjali. Haradatta is quoted by Mallinātha while he himself quotes Māgha. It is assumed that Haradatta flourished in the twelfth century A.D.

The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini was remoulded

by later grammarians belonging to the school of Pāṇini who arranged the Sūtras of Pāṇini according to the topics selected for discussion. Rāmacandra who flourished in the first half of the fifteenth century A.D., wrote his *Prakriyākaumudī* which is supposed to be the model for Bhaṭṭoji's *Siddhāntakaumudī*. The most famous commentary, the *Prasāda*, on the *Prakriyākaumudī* was written by Viṭṭhalācārya in the first half of the sixteenth century A.D.

**Rāma-  
candra :**  
**Prakriyā-  
kaumudī**

The *Siddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji is a recast of the Sūtras of Pāṇini in the topical method. Bhaṭṭoji flourished in seventeenth century A.D. Bhaṭṭoji himself wrote a commentary on his *Siddhāntakaumudī* which is called the *Praudhāmanoramā*. His *Śabdakaustubha* is an authoritative commentary on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. It is true that Bhaṭṭoji's reputation as an authority on Sanskrit grammar is enviable. The most famous commentary on the *Siddhāntakaumudī* is the *Tattva-bodhinī* by Jñānendra Sarasvatī of the eighteenth century A.D. The *Bāla-manoramā* of Vāsudeva is an easy commentary on the *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

**Bhaṭṭoji :**  
**Siddhānta-  
kaumudī &  
other works**

Nāgeśabhaṭṭa was a versatile genius of the

**Nāgeśa :**  
**his works**

eighteenth century A.D. who wrote treatises not only on grammar but also on Yoga, Alaṅkāra and other subjects. Among his important works in grammar are the *Uddyota*, a commentary on Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa*, the *Bṛhacchabdendusekhara* and the *Laghuśabdendusekhara* (both commentaries on Bhaṭṭoji's *Siddhāntakaumudī*) and the *Paribhāṣendusekhara*, a collection of Paribhāṣās in connection with Pāṇini's grammar. The *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamañjūṣā* (*Bṛhat* and *Laghu*) is another outstanding work which has discussed various topics of Sanskrit grammar.<sup>1</sup>

**Varadarāja :**  
**his works**

Varadarāja, a very recent writer popularized his name by making abridgements of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. His two books, the *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* and the *Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī* are widely read by all beginners of Sanskrit grammar.

C

## OTHER IMPORTANT SCHOOLS OF GRAMMAR

Candragomin flourished in the middle of the fifth century A.D. Bhartṛhari in his

<sup>1</sup> According to the tradition which we have been privileged to inherit and which comes down uninterruptedly from Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, the *Paramalaghumāñjūṣā* is not the work of Nāgeśa.

*Vākyapadīya* refers to the Cāndra school of grammarians. The object of Candra-gomin was to rearrange with marked brevity the system of Pāṇini. The Cāndra grammar, however, gained much popularity and was widely commented upon. The commentaries are now preserved mostly in Tibetan translations.

**Cāndra  
school**

According to Professor Pāthak Jainendra flourished in the latter part of the fifth century A.D. Jainendra lacks originality inasmuch as he condenses Pāṇini and the Vārttikas. Two main commentaries on this grammar have been preserved—one by Abhayānandī (750 A.D.) and another called *Śabdārṇavacandrikā* by Somadeva.

**Jainendra-  
school**

Śākaṭāyana, the founder of a school after his name, should not be confused with the ancient Śākaṭāyana mentioned by Pāṇini. Śākaṭāyana wrote his *Śabdānuśāsana* in the first quarter of the ninth century A.D. *Amoghavṛtti* is another work of this author. Śākaṭāyana has based his work upon Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Jinendra. Śākaṭāyana is also credited with the authorship of (i) the *Paribhāṣāsūtras* (ii) the *Gaṇapāṭha* (iii) the *Dhātupāṭha* (iv) the *Uṇādisūtras* and (v) the *Līṅgānuśāsana*.

**Śākaṭāyana  
school**

**Hema-  
candra  
school**

Hemacandra, the prolific Jaina writer, wrote his *Śabdānuśāsana* in the eleventh century A.D. The book consists of more than *four thousand* Sūtras, and is a compilation rather than an original work. Hemacandra himself wrote a commentary of his book known as *Śabdānuśāsana-bṛhadvṛtti*.

**Kātantra  
school**

Sarvavarman is the author of the *Kātantrasūtras* otherwise known as the Kaumāra and the Kālāpa. The beginnings of this school go to the early centuries of the Christian era. There are, however, evidences of later interpolations in the *Kātantra-sūtras*. Sarvavarman's views are in many places different from those of Pāṇini. Durgasiṃha wrote his famous *Vṛtti* on this grammar not later than the ninth century A.D. Durgasiṃha's *Vṛtti* was commented by Vardhamāna in the eleventh century A.D. Prṭhvidhara wrote a sub-commentary on Vardhamāna's work. The Kātantra school has been highly popular in Bengal and Kāshmir.

**Sārasvata  
school**

Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya is the author of the *Sārasvataprakriyā*, who flourished in the middle of the fourteenth century A.D. Brevity of expression is a characteristic of

this school. Some of the many commentators on the *Sārasvataprakriyā*, are Puñjarāja, Amṛtabhārati, Kṣemendra and others.

Vopadeva wrote his *Mugdhabodha* in the thirteenth century A.D. Vopadeva's style is brief and simple. His technical terms in many places differ from those of Pāṇini. Rāma Tarkavāgiśa is the most celebrated commentator of this grammar.

**Mugdha-  
bodha  
school**

Kramadīśvara wrote his *Samkṣiptasāra* in the thirteenth century A.D. The work has *eight* sections and the illustrations have been taken from the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*. The *Samkṣiptasāra* underwent a thorough revision in the hand of Jumarānandin who wrote a commentary called the *Rasavatī*. This grammar is widely read in Western Bengal.

**Jaumara  
school**

The author of the *Supadma* is Padmanābha who flourished in the fourteenth century A.D. This system of grammar, like many other systems, is based on Pāṇini. Padmanābha himself wrote a commentary known as the *Supadmapañjikā*.

**Saupadma  
school**

## D

### SECTARIAN SCHOOLS OF GRAMMAR

In recent centuries there flourished some grammarians who wanted to make grammar

**Harinā-  
māmṛta &  
Caitanyā-  
mṛta**

the vehicle of religion. This tendency was already present in Vopadeva. Rūpagosvāmin wrote his *Harināmāmṛta* in the fifteenth century A.D. The names of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā are used as actual technical terms of grammar. Jivagosvāmin wrote a grammar of the same name. A third Vaiṣṇava grammar named *Caitanyāmṛta* is mentioned by Professor Colebrooke.

## E

### SOME IMPORTANT WORKS ON GRAMMER

- Durghaṭavṛtti* : by Śaraṇadeva—a Bengali Buddhist of the twelfth century A.D.—dealing with derivations of difficult words.
- Bhāṣāvṛtti* : by Puruṣottamadeva of the twelfth century A.D.—a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (sections on Vedic accent are left out).
- Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* : by Vardhamāna in 1140 A.D.
- Paribhāṣāvṛtti* : by Śīradeva—a collection of *paribhāṣās* with their explanation.
- Dhātupradīpa* : by Maitreyarakṣita who is later than Hemacandra—containing a list of roots and their uses.
- Dhātuvṛtti* : by Mādhava, son of Sāyaṇa—written after the model of the *Dhātupradīpa*.

*Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa* & *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra* } by Kaunḍabhaṭṭa, nephew of Bhaṭṭoji—dealing with philosophical and other points of Sanskrit grammar.

*Śabdaratna* : by Haridikṣita, grandson of Bhaṭṭoji and teacher of Nāgeśa—a commentary on the *Prauḍhamanoramā*.

*Prauḍhamanoramūkucamardīnī* : by Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, the great rhetorician—a criticism of the *Prauḍhamanoramā*.

#### REFERENCES

- Belvalkar, S. K. : Systems of Sanskrit Grammar.  
 Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.
-



## CHAPTER ELEVEN

### POETICS AND DRAMATURGY

A

#### INTRODUCTION

**Bharata :**  
**Nāṭyaśāstra**

The literature on poetics and dramaturgy is conspicuously rich in Classical Sanskrit. Many able thinkers have written important works both on poetics and dramaturgy, and it is also a fact that one and the same author has written on both these subjects of kindred nature. Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the earliest known treatise on poetics and dramaturgy. The date of this monumental composition has been variously assigned by scholars to the period between the second century B.C. and third century A.D. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* shows unmistakable proofs of a systematic tradition which has preceded it by at least a century. Bharata has been held in high esteem by all later writers on poetics and his work has continued to be a source of inspiration to them.

**Four**  
**schools of**  
**poetics**

With the progress of years there arose *four* main schools of poetics which maintain different views with regard to the essential characteristics of poetry. Thus from time

to time, *Alaṅkāra* (Figure), *Riti* (Style), *Rasa* (Aesthetic pleasure) and *Dhvani* (Suggestion) have been declared to be the essential factors of poetry. The *Dhvani* school, however, has grown to be the most important of all other schools of *Alaṅkāra* literature. *Ānandavardhana*, the author of the *Dhva-nyāloka* is known to be the pioneer of this school and it has been for his commentator *Abhinavagupta* to bring out the importance of the doctrine of *Dhvani* through his lasting contributions.<sup>1</sup>

*Bhāmaha* is one of the earliest rhetoricians to take up a systematic discussion of poetic embellishments after *Bharata's* treatment of figures. *Bhāmaha* flourished in all probability in the seventh century A.D. His only work, the *Kāvyaṭalaṅkāra*, contains six chapters. In his definition of poetry *Bhāmaha* has accorded equal status to 'word' and 'import', though he has devoted more attention to the former.

*Udbhaṭa* wrote his *Alaṅkārasaṅgraha* in

(i) **Alaṅ-  
kāra school**

**Bhāmaha :**  
**Kāvyaṭalaṅ-  
kāra**

<sup>1</sup> According to modern scholars, a comparatively late work on Indian poetics is the *Agnipurāṇa* where in as many as eleven chapters, a comprehensive and authoritative information about the various schools of poetics known to the author is available.

**Udbhaṭa :**  
**Alaṅkāra-**  
**saṁgraha**

the latter half of the eighth century A.D. The work is a collection of verses defining *forty-one* figures and contains *six* chapters. In his treatment of figures Udbhaṭa has followed in the line of Bhāmaha.<sup>1</sup>

**Rudraṭa :**  
**Kāvyaālā-**  
**kāra**

Rudraṭa wrote his *Kāvyaālāṅkāra* in the first quarter of the ninth century A.D. The work which is in *sixteen* chapters, deals mainly with figures of poetry. In his treatment of figures Rudraṭa seems to have been the follower of a tradition different from that of Bhāmaha and Udbhaṭa. Of the three commentators of Rudraṭa, Namisādhū appears to be the most important.

**(ii) Rīti**  
**school**

**Daṇḍin**  
**Kāvyaadarśa**

Daṇḍin, the author of the *Kāvyaadarśa*, is the precursor to the Rīti school which was developed by Vāmana. Though Daṇḍin is usually assigned to the seventh century A.D., still the mutual priority of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin is a disputed point in the history of Sanskrit poetics. Daṇḍin appears to have been greatly influenced by the Alaṅkāra school. His most outstanding con-

<sup>1</sup> Though Udbhaṭa belongs to the Alaṅkāra school, his well-known commentator Pratihārendurāja, a pupil of Mukulabhaṭṭa, is a follower of the Rasa school. Pratihārendurāja is assigned to the first half of the tenth century A.D.

tribution to poetics is the concept of Guṇa. In his definition of poetry Daṇḍin gives more importance to the word-element than to the sense-element. The most authoritative commentator of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* is Taruṇavācaspati.

Vāmana who flourished in the latter half of the eighth century A.D., wrote his *Kāvya-lāṅkārasūtra* in five chapters and twelve sections in which he boldly asserted that Riti is the soul of poetry. The ten Guṇas are important in so far as they constitute Riti. The *Kāmadhenu*, a late work by Gopendra Tippa Bhūpāla, is a lucid commentary on the *Kāvya-lāṅkārasūtra*.

**Vāmana :**  
**Kāvya-lāṅ-**  
**kārasūtra**

The Rasa school originated from the interpretations by different commentators of Bharata's aphorism on Rasa. Lollaṭa who is known to be the earliest interpreter, flourished in the eighth century A.D. The work of Lollaṭa is unfortunately lost to us, though a review of his opinion is found in the *Abhinavabhāratī* of Abhinavagupta and the *Kāvya-prakāśa* of Mammata.

**(iii) Rasa**  
**school**

**Lollaṭa**

Another interpreter is Śrī-Śaṅkuka who has criticized the views of Lollaṭa. The work of Śrī-Śaṅkuka also is lost to us. He is believed to be a junior contemporary of Lollaṭa.

**Śrī-Śaṅkuka**

**Bhaṭṭa-  
nāyaka :  
Hṛdaya-  
darpaṇa**

Bhaṭṭanāyaka is the most celebrated commentator of the Rasa school. He is said to have flourished between the last quarter of the ninth century A.D. and the beginning of the tenth century A.D. His work, the *Hṛdayadarpaṇa*, is unfortunately lost to us. Bhaṭṭanāyaka has rejected the views of Lollaṭa and Śrī-Śaṅkuka. It is interesting to note that Bhaṭṭanāyaka has recognized *two* additional powers of word, viz., the power of generalization (*bhāva-katva*) by which the meaning is made intelligible to the audience and the power of *bhojakatva* which enables the audience to relish the enjoyment of the poem.

**(iv) Dhvani  
school**

**Ānandavar-  
dhana :  
Dhvanyā-  
loka**

The doctrine of Dhvani according to which 'suggestion' is held to be the essence of poetry, was formulated by Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* in the middle of the ninth century A.D. Ānandavardhana informs us that the doctrine of Dhvani is very old, the dim beginnings of which are lost in oblivion. According to Ānandavardhana, word is not only endowed with the *two* powers of denotation (*śakti*) and implication (*lakṣaṇā*) but also of suggestion (*vyañjanā*). Through the power of sugges-

tion, either a subject, or a figure or a sentiment is revealed.

The views of Ānandavardhana found a large and definite shape in the writings of his erudite commentator Abhinavagupta who flourished at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. Abhinavagupta has to his credit two important commentaries on poetics which may be looked upon as independent treatises and these are the *Locana* on the *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana and the *Abhinavabhāratī* on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata. Abhinavagupta thinks that all suggestion must be of sentiment, for the suggestion of subject or that of figure may be ultimately reduced to the suggestion of sentiment.

**Abhinava-  
gupta :  
Locana &  
Abhinava-  
bhāratī**

## B

### WORKS ON POETICS & DRAMATURGY

*Abhidhāvṛttimātrkā* : by Mukulabhaṭṭa who is generally assigned to the period between the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century A. D.— a grammatico-rhetorical work.

*Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* : by Rājaśekhara of the tenth century A.D.—written in *eighteen*

chapters— a practical hand-book for poets.

*Vakroktijīvita* : by Kuntala or Kuntaka who flourished in the middle of the tenth century A.D. and belonged to a reactionary school to Dhvani—upholding Vakrokti (figurative speech) as the essence of poetry. (The Vakrokti school is an off-shoot of the older Alaṅkāra school).

*Daśarūpaka* : by Dhanañjaya of the tenth century A.D.—containing also a section on dramaturgy besides sections on Rasa and allied topics—commented on by Dhanika, a contemporary of Dhanañjaya in his *Avaloka*.

*Aucityavicāra and Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa* } : by Kṣemendra of the eleventh century A.D.—the first, discussing propriety as essential to sentiment and the second, discussing such topics as the possibility of becoming a poet, the issue of borrowing, etc., etc.

*Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa and Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* } : by Bhoja of the first half of the eleventh century A.D.—the first, an encyclopaedic work containing information about different schools of poetics and the second, a supplement to the first and containing a section on dramaturgy.

*Vyaktiviveka* : by Mahimabhaṭṭa of the second half of the eleventh century A.D. who belonged to the reactionary school

to Dhvani—containing discussions on the possibility of including Dhvani under inference.

*Kāvyaṣṭakāśa* : by Maṃmaṭa of the eleventh century A.D.—highly influenced by the writings of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta—discussing Rasa as the soul of poetry—commented on by Rucaka (identified with Ruṃyaka, author of the *Alaṅkāra-sarvasva*), Māṇikyacandra, Śrīdhara, Caṇḍīdāsa, Viśvanātha and Govinda, besides a number of minor commentators.

*Bhāvyaṣṭakāśa* : by Śāradātanaya who flourished in the first half of the twelfth century A.D. and was one of the later writers on Rasa—highly influenced by the works of Bhoja—dealing with topics of drama.

*Alaṅkārasarvasva* : by Ruṃyaka of the latter half of the twelfth century A.D.—written in the line of Udbhaṭa—discussing the importance of Dhvani in so far as it embellishes the expressed meaning—commented on by Jayaratha, Vidyācakravartin and others.

*Kāvyaānuśāsa* : by Hemacandra, belonging to the twelfth century A.D. who has borrowed from the writings of Abhinavagupta, Maṃmaṭa, Kuntala and others.



*Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra* : by Vāgbhaṭa of the twelfth century A.D.—a work in verses.

*Caṇḍrāloka* : by Jayadeva who was not earlier than the twelfth century A.D.—a convenient manual of figures of speech with happy illustrations.

*Rasamañjarī* & *Rasatarāṅgī* } : by Bhānudatta who was not earlier than the twelfth century A.D.—the two works treating of Rasa and allied topics.

*Nāṭyadarpaṇa* : by Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra of the twelfth century A.D.—a work on dramaturgy differing widely from the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata.

*Kāvyaṇuśāsana* : by Vāgbhaṭa of the thirteenth century A.D. who has followed Hemacandra.

*Kavītārahasya* or *Kāvyaikalpalatā* } : by Arisimha and his pupil Amara-  
candra, two Śvetāmbara Jainas, belonging to the thirteenth century A.D.

*Kavikalpalatā* : by Deveśvara, a Jaina writer, probably belonging to the thirteenth century A.D.

*Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnaśoṣa* : by Sāgaranandin of the thirteenth century A.D.—a work on dramaturgy—strictly following the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

*Ekāvalī* : by Vidyādhara of the fourteenth century A.D.—written for King Narasiṃha of Orissa—belonging to the Dhvani school—commented on by Mallinātha in his *Taralā*.

*Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣaṇa* : by Vidyānātha of the fourteenth century A.D.—written for King Pratāparudra of Warangal—a voluminous treatise containing various informations about poetics and dramaturgy.

*Sāhityadarpaṇa* : by Viśvanātha of the fourteenth century A.D.—treating in the manner of Mammaṭa, Rasa as the soul of poetry, though fully acknowledging the importance of Dhvani—containing discussions on both poetics and dramaturgy—criticizing Mammaṭa and in turn criticized by Govinda and Jagannātha.

*Ujjvalanīlamanī* : by Rūpagosvāmin of the sixteenth century A.D. who regards the Erotic as only a different name of the Devotional (*Bhakti*)—commented on by Jivagosvāmin who flourished after him in the same century, in his *Locanarocanī*.

*Alaṅkāraśekhara* : by Keśavamīśra of the sixteenth century A.D.—a short treatise on poetics, the Kārikās of which according to the author are the composition of Śauddhodani.

*Citramīmāṃsā* and *Kuvalayānanda* } : by Appayyadikṣita of the seventeenth century A.D., who is noted for his critical insight and originality of appreciation - the first has been criticized by Jagannātha and the second is based on the *Candrāloka* of Jayadeva.

*Rasagaṅgādhara* : by Jagannātha of the seventeenth century A.D. who is the last of the Titans in Indian poetics and evinces a superb power of criticism and presentation—an important work on the dialectics of Indian poetics in particular.

### REFERENCES

- De, S. K. : Sanskrit Poetics, Vols. I & II.  
Kane, P. V. : Sāhityadarpaṇa (Introduction).  
Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.
-

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### METRICS

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

In the Brāhmaṇas we find discussions on metrical matters and it may be presumed that at that time the study of metrics was deemed essential as one of six Vedāṅgas.

**Metrics :  
a Vedāṅga**

Piṅgala is, however, the earliest known author on prosody. In his work which is of the Sūtra-type, we find for the first time the use of algebraic symbols. The book discusses both Vedic and Classical metres. Scholars opine that Piṅgala's work is surely earlier than the chapters on metre (chs. XIV, XV) in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and the metrical section of the *Agnipurāṇa*. The text attributed to this author on Prākṛit metres (*Prākṛta-Piṅgala*) is undoubtedly a later work.

**Piṅgala  
his Sūtra**

#### B

#### WORKS ON METRICS

*Śrutabodha* : ascribed to Kālidāsa and often attributed to Vararuci—a manual of Classical metres.

- Suvṛttatīlaka* : by Kṣemendra of the eleventh century A.D.—containing a variety of Classical metres.
- Chando'nuśāsana* : by Hemacandra of the twelfth century A.D.—a compilation and not an original work.
- Vṛttaratnākara* : by Kedārabhaṭṭa ( earlier than the fifteenth century A.D. )—a bulky book dealing with *one hundred and thirty-six* metres.
- Vṛttaratnākara* : by Nārāyaṇa of the sixteenth century A.D.
- Chandomañjarī* : by Gaṅgādāsa—a late and yet popular work on prosody.

### REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
 Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
 Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.
-

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### LEXICOGRAPHY

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

Yāska's *Nirukta* is the oldest extant lexicographic work which contains a collection of Vedic terms. The lexicons of Classical Sanskrit literature are in many respects different from the *Nirukta*. One of the salient points of difference is that the Classical dictionaries treat of nouns and indeclinables while the *Nighaṇṭus* contain both nominal and verbal forms. Almost all the lexicographical works of Classical Sanskrit are written in verse.

**Yāska .  
Nirukta**

The *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* or the *Amara-kośa* is one of the earliest lexicographical works in Classical Sanskrit. Amarasimha, the author, probably flourished in the seventh century A.D. He is, however, believed to have been one of the 'nine gems' in the court of the famous Vikramāditya. Of the many commentators of this work, Kṣīrasvāmin, Sarvānanda, Bhānuji and Maheśvara are well-known.

**Amara-  
simha :  
Amarakośa**

## B

## LESS IMPORTANT LEXICONS

*Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* & *Hārāvalī* } by Puruṣottama—both early lexi-  
: cons, containing a collection of  
many rare words.

*Anekārthasamuccaya* : by Śāśvata, a contemporary of  
Amarasiṃha.

*Abhidhānaratnamālā* : by Halāyudha of the tenth  
century A.D.

*Vaiṣṭyanī* : by Yūdava of the eleventh century A.D.

*Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* } by Hemacandra of the twelfth  
& *Anekārthasaṅgraha* } : century A.D.—both contain-  
ing a rich variety of words.

*Viśvaprakāśa* : by Meheśvara of the twelfth century A.D.

*Anekārthasabdakośa* : by Medinikāra of the four-  
teenth century A.D.

*Vācaspatya* : by Tārūnātha Tarkavācaspati of the  
nineteenth century A.D.—an en-  
cyclopaedic work of outstanding  
merit.

*Śabdakalpadrūpa* : an encyclopaedic compilation  
made by a batch of Sanskrit  
Pandits in the nineteenth century  
A.D., under the patronage of Rājā  
Sir Rādhakānta Deva.

## REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.

# CHAPTER FOURTEEN

## CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LAW

### A

#### GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF LEGAL WORKS

Besides the Śrautasūtras and the Gr̥hya-sūtras there were in ancient times a number of Dharmasūtras which may be viewed as rudimentary texts on civil and religious law. Among these Dharmasūtras mention must be made of the *Dharmasūtras* of Gautama, Hārīta, Vaśiṣṭha, Bodhāyana, Āpastamba, Hiranyakeśin and others. It is not definitely known when these Sūtras were composed but it is generally believed that their age would approximately be the fifth or the fourth century B.C. Two other Dharmasūtras, the *Vaiṣṇavadharmasūtra* and the *Vaikhānasadharmasūtra* were written at a later period, the former being assigned to the third century A.D.

**Early  
Dharma-  
sūtras**

The most outstanding and popular work on Brāhmaṇical laws is the *Mānavadharmasāstra* or the *Manusmṛti*. Though the author of this work is generally known to be



**Manusmṛti :  
authorship**

Manu, still the present text is said to have been the work of Bhṛgu. Again, from certain references it becomes evident that the present version of the *Manusmṛti* was narrated by one student of Bhṛgu and not by Bhṛgu himself even. Dr. Bühler suggests that the *Mānavadharmasāstra* or the *Manusmṛti* is a recaṣt and versification of one original work of the type of Sūtra works known as the *Mānavasūtrakaraṇa*, a subdivision of the Maitrāyaṇīya school which adheres to a redaction of the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*.

**Age**

It has been argued that the present text of the *Manusmṛti* contains various facts about the supremacy of the Brāhmaṇas over other castes. The presumption, therefore, is that the work was written at a time when the Brāhmaṇas were kings of India and had great power in their hands. History tells us that there were Brāhmaṇa kings in India after the fall of the Śuṅgas. It is known that the Kāṇvas ruled in ancient India for forty-five years in the first century B.C. It is suggested that the present text of the *Manusmṛti* was prepared during the reign of the Kāṇvas.

The *Manusmṛti* is written in lucid

Sanskrit verse which comprises 2684 couplets arranged in *twelve* chapters. The work has been commented on by numerous scholars including Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Nārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda and Nandana.

**Contents &  
commen-  
tators**

## B

### IMPORTANT WORKS ON LAW

*Nāradaśmṛti* : Presumably a late work which has its individual merits but cannot stand comparison with the work of Manu—usually regarded as the legal supplement to the *Manusmṛti*.

*Bṛhaspatismṛti* : A supplementary work to the *Manusmṛti*—belonging to the sixth or the seventh century A.D.

*Yājñavalkyasmṛti* : An important work in the style of the *Manusmṛti*—containing a methodical and highly satisfactory treatment with stamps of individuality—not earlier than the third century A.D.—commented on by Viṣṇuśara of the eleventh century A.D. in his *Mitākṣarā*. ✓

*Tatātītamātātīlaka*,  
*Saṁskārapaddhati*  
& *Prāyaścittaprakaraṇa* } by Bhavadēvabhāṭṭa (eleventh century A.D.), the famous minister of King Harivarman of south Bengal.

*Smṛtikalpataṛu* : by Lakṣmīdhara, minister of Govindacandra of Kanauj (twelfth century A.D.)

*Parāśarasmṛti* : The author of this work is not the same person quoted as an authority by Yājñavalkya—commented on by Mādhava, of the fourteenth century A.D., in his *Parāśara-mādhava*.

*Brāhmaṇasarvasva* : by Halāyudha, of the twelfth century A.D.—written for King Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal.

*Daśakarmapaddhati* : by Paśupati of the twelfth century A.D.

*Pitṛdayitā* : by Aniruddha of the twelfth century A.D.

*Caturvargacintāmaṇi* : by Hemādri of the thirteenth century A.D.—a voluminous work.

*Dharmaratna* : by Jīmūtavāhana of the fourteenth century A.D.—an important work containing the famous *Dāyabhāgā* which dominates the views of Bengal on inheritance.

*Dīpakalīkā* : by Śūlapāṇi of the fourteenth century A.D.—a commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*.

*Madanapārijāta* : by Viśveśvara of the fourteenth century A.D.—a work on religious laws.

<p><i>Vivādaratnākara</i>, <i>Smṛtiratnākara</i> and other <i>Ratnākara</i>s</p>	}	<p>by Caṇḍeśvara, grand-uncle of Vidyāpati, minister of Hari- siṃha of the fourteenth cen- tury A.D.—very important law books.</p>
--	---	--

*Rāghunandanasmṛtis* : by Rāghunandana of the sixteenth century A.D.—*twenty-eight* in number—all bearing the appella-

tion of '*Tattva*', e.g., *Tithitattva*,  
*Udvāhatattva*, etc.—highly autho-  
 ritative, specially in Bengal.

<i>Vivādacintāmaṇi</i> , <i>Vyavahāracintāmaṇi</i> and other <i>Cintāmaṇis</i>	}	by Vācaspati who wrote for Bhairavasimha (Harinārā- yaṇa) and Rāmaḥhadra : (Rūpanārāyaṇa) of Mithilā (fifteenth century A.D.)— highly important law books.
---	---	---

*Viramitrodaya* : by Mitramiśra of the seventeenth  
 century A.D.—a voluminous work.

*Nirṇayasindhu* : by Kamalākarabhaṭṭa of the seven-  
 teenth century A.D.

### REFERENCES

Bühler, G. : SBE. Vol. XXV.

Kane, P. V. : History of Dharmaśāstra.

Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.



## CHAPTER FIFTEEN

### POLITICS

#### A

### INTRODUCTION

**Kauṭilya :**  
**Artha-**  
**śāstra**

Of the four objects of life the science of politics deals with the aim and achievement of the second (*artha*) and Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* amply proves the existence of the study of political science and practical life in ancient India. The *Arthaśāstra* is an outstanding work in the field of Indian politics and is claimed by some modern scholars to have been composed sometime in the third century A.D., though traditionally the author is believed to have been none other than Cāṇakya or Viṣṇugupta, the able minister of Maurya Candragupta (fourth century B.C.), who has been unanimously recognized by all scholars as the Machiavelli of India. The *Arthaśāstra*, however, mentions *Bṛhaspati*, *Bāhudantiputra*, *Viśālākṣa* and *Uśanas* as authorities. The book is a perfect manual for the conduct of kings in their political existence. Later works on this science are mainly based on the *Arthaśāstra*.

## B

## MINOR WORKS ON POLITICS

*Nītisāra* : by Kāmandaka—written in verse with the character of a Kāvya—not later than the eighth century A.D.

*Nītivākyaṃṛta* : by Somadeva, the author of Yaśas-tilaka—the details of war and kindred topics are meagrely dealt with and the author appears to be a great moral teacher.

*Laghu Arhannīti* : by the great Jaina writer Hemacandra (1088 A.D.—1172 A.D.)—written in verse—an abbreviation of another bigger work of the author written in Prākṛit.

*Yuktikalpataru* : ascribed to Bhoja.

*Nītiratnākara* : by Caṇḍeśvara, a jurist—grand-uncle of Vidyāpati.

*Śukranīti* : of unknown authorship—a work of a very late date, mentioning the use of gunpowder.

## REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

### EROTICS

#### A

#### INTRODUCTION

**Vātsyāyana:**  
**Kāmasūtra**

Erotics or the science of love was specially studied in ancient India. The most outstanding work on the subject is the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana who is placed sometime in the third century A.D. The work is divided into *seven* parts and is written in prose interspersed with stray verses. The work does not claim to have been the first to be written on that subject. The work is a mine of informations on matters relating to the social order and customs of the day.

**Yāśodhara :**  
**Jaya-**  
**maṅgalā**

Yāśodhara of the thirteenth century A.D., wrote a commentary, the *Jayamaṅgalā*, on the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana. Credit is due to this commentator who has explained many technical terms used by Vātsyāyana.

#### B

#### MINOR WORKS ON EROTICS

*Pañcasāyaka* : by Jyotirīśvara—later than Kṣemendra.  
*Ratirahasya* : by Kokkoka—prior to 1200 A.D.

*Ratimañjarī* : by one Jayadeva of unknown date—  
sometimes identified with the  
poet of the *Gītagovinda*.

*Anaṅgarāṅga* : by Kalyāṇamalla of the sixteenth  
century A.D.

*Ratīśūtra* · by Nāgārjuna of unknown date—often  
wrongly identified with the great  
Buddhist thinker.

### REFERENCE

Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

---



## CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

### MEDICINE

#### A

#### HISTORY OF MEDICAL WORKS

##### Introduc- tion

A study of Vedic literature will reveal that Anatomy, Embryology and Hygiene were known to Vedic Indians. The science of Āyurveda was also looked upon as one of the auxiliary sciences to the Vedas. There are references in early literature to ancient sages who delivered instruction on the science of medicine. Ātreya is one of these sages who is usually held to be the founder of the science while Cāṇakya is said to have written on medicine. According to Buddhist tradition, Jivaka, a student of Ātreya, was a specialist in the diseases of children.

##### Caraka

The earliest extant literature on medicine is the *Carakasamhitā*. Caraka, according to Professor Lévi, was a contemporary of King Kaniṣka. It is, however, known that the present text of Caraka was revised by one Dr̥ḍhabala, a Kāshmirian, who lived as late as the eighth or the ninth century A.D.

Suśruta is another great teacher of Indian medicine whose name occurs in the famous

Bower Manuscript and who is mentioned as the son of Viśvāmitra in the *Mahābhārata*. As early as the ninth and the tenth centuries his reputation travelled far beyond India. Among his commentators, mention must be made of Cakrapāṇidatta (eleventh century A.D.), besides Jaiyyaṭa, Gayadāsa and Dallana.

**Suśruta &  
his com-  
mentators**

Bhela is another authority who is said to have written a *Samhitā* which, in the opinion of some scholars, is earlier than the work of Caraka.

**Bhela**

## B

### LATER MEDICAL WORKS

*Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha* and *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā* } by Vāgbhaṭa, the next  
: great authority after  
Suśruta—often identified  
with the medical authority  
referred to by I-tsing.

*Rasaratnākara* : by Nāgārjuna, probably of the seventh or the eighth century A.D.  
—containing a section on the practical application of mercury.

*Nidāna* : by Mādhavakara of the eighth or the ninth century A.D.—an important treatise on Pathology.

*Cikitsāsārasamgraha* : by Cakrapāṇidatta : a work on Therapeutics.

*Cikitsākalā* : by Tiṣata of the fourteenth century  
A.D.

*Bhāvaprakāśa* : by Bhāvamīśra of the sixteenth  
century A.D.

*Vaidyaṭīra* : by Lolimbarāja of the seventeenth  
century A.D.

### REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.

---

## CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

### ASTRONOMY, MATHEMATICS AND ASTROLOGY

#### A

#### HISTORY OF ASTRONOMY

It is not definitely known whether Astronomy was systematically studied as a science in Vedic times. It is as late as the sixth century A.D. when in the *Pañca-siddhāntikā* of Varāhamihira we get the information about the contents of five Siddhāntas of an earlier date. It is, however, a fact that the lunar mansions were known to Vedic Indians. Dr. Weber says that the names of some asterisms occur in the *R̥gveda*, the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, the *Taittirīyasamhitā* and the *Atharvaveda*. It is presumed that with the discovery of planets, the science of Astronomy made a significant advance. Planets are mentioned in the *Taittirīyāranyaka* the two Great Epics, and the Law-books of Manu. It still remains an open question, however, whether the ancient Indians discovered the planets independently of others or whether

**Astronomy:  
an early  
science**

the knowledge came to them from a foreign source. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that Indian Astronomy thrived well under Greek influence.

## B

## WORKS ON ASTRONOMY

**Āryabhaṭa :**  
**his works**

Before the discovery of the *Pañca-siddhāntikā*, Āryabhaṭa was regarded as the only authority on Indian Astronomy. Āryabhaṭa wrote towards the close of the fifth century A.D. Three of his works now available to us are the *Āryabhaṭīya*, in ten stanzas, the *Daśagītikāsūtra* and the *Āryāṣṭasāta* in which there is a section on Mathematics.

**Āryabhaṭa :**  
**Ārya-**  
**siddhānta**

Āryabhaṭa is to be carefully distinguished from another author of the same name who wrote the *Āryasiddhānta* in the tenth century A.D. and was known to Albēṛūnī.

**Brahma-**  
**gupta : his**  
**works**

Brahmagupta is another great name in Indian Astronomy who in the seventh century A.D. wrote *two* important works, the *Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta* and the *Khaṇḍakhādyaka*.

Lalla who is later than Brahmagupta, has to his credit one work the *Śiṣyadhīvr-ddhitantra*.

**Lalla .  
Śiṣyadhīvr-  
ddhitantra**

To the eleventh century belong two writers Bhoja and Śatānanda whose works are respectively, the *Rājāmṛgāṅka* and the *Bhāsvatī*.

**Bhoja &  
Śatānanda :  
their works**

Bhāskarācārya of 1150 A.D. wrote his masterpiece, the *Siddhāntaśiromaṇi*, which is divided into four sections. A second work of his is the *Karaṇakutūhala*.

**Bhāskara :  
his works**

## C

### WORKS ON MATHEMATICS

In the field of Indian Mathematics, there are only a few names. Aryabhaṭa was the first to include in his work a section on Mathematics. Brahmagupta has discussed the principles of ordinary Arithmetic in a brief manner. In the ninth century A.D. Mahāvīrācārya wrote an elementary but comprehensive work on Indian Mathematics. In the tenth century A.D. he wrote his *Triṣatī* which discusses quadratic equations. It was Bhāskarācārya who in the two sections viz., *Līlāvātī* and *Bījagaṇita* of his work, the *Siddhāntaśiromaṇi*, made

**Āryabhaṭa,  
Brahma-  
gupta,  
Mahāvīra &  
Bhāskara**

some lasting contributions to Indian Mathematics.

## D

### WORKS ON ASTROLOGY

#### Early works :

In India Astrology has been studied as a science from very ancient times. The works of Varāhamihira, of course, eclipsed the fame of earlier authorities whose writings are now lost to us. Fragments of one *Vṛddhagarga-saṁhitā* are still available. Varāhamihira classified Astrology into the *three* branches of *Tantra*—the astronomical and mathematical foundations, *Horā*—that dealing with horoscope and *Samhitā*—that discussing natural Astrology. The most outstanding contribution of Varāhamihira is the *Bṛhat-saṁhitā* which was commented on by Bhaṭṭotpala. On the *Horā* section Varāhamihira wrote two works, the *Bṛhajjātaka* and the *Laghujātaka*. Besides the works of Varāhamihira, we find a reference to one *Yavanajātaka* of dubious authorship.

#### Later works

Among later works on Astrology, mention may be made of the *Horāśatapañcāśikā* by Prthuyāśas, son of Varāhamihira, the *Horāśāstra* by Bhaṭṭotpala, the *Vidyā-*

*mādhavīya* (before 1350 A.D.) the *Vṛddha-vāsiṣṭhasaṃhitā* of unknown authorship, the *Jyotiṣasāroddhāra* of Harṣakīrti, the *Jyotirvidyābharāṇa* of unknown authorship (not later than the sixteenth century A.D.) and the *Tājikā* in two parts (the *Samjñā-tantra* and the *Varṣatantra*) of Nīlakaṇṭha (sixteenth century A.D.)<sup>1</sup>

### REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
 Macdonell, A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
 Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.
- 

<sup>1</sup> Closely associated with works on Astrology are treatises on omens and prognostications. Among such treatises are the *Adbhutasāgara* (twelfth century A.D.) and the *Samudratilaka* (twelfth century A.D.) by Durlabharāja and Jagaddeva. The *Ramalarahasya* of Bhayabhañjanaśarman is a work on geomancy and under the style of the *Pāśakakevali*, preserved in the Bower Manuscript, are the two treatises on cubomancy.



## CHAPTER NINETEEN

### MISCELLANEOUS SCIENCES

#### Archery

It is a pity that though the Indians specialized in almost every branch of Sanskrit literature, the literature on quite a good number of minor sciences is little known to us. Thus there are no extant works on Archery. Among the authoritative writers on Archery the names of Vikramāditya, Sadāśiva and Śāraṅgadatta have reached us.

#### Sciences of elephants & horses

On the sciences of elephants and horses which are associated with the names of two ancient sages Pālakāpya and Śālihotra respectively, a few works are available. The *Hastyāyurveda* of uncertain date and the *Mātāṅgalīlā* of Nārāyaṇa are the two known works on the science of elephants. The *Aśvāyurveda* of Gaṇa, the *Aśvavaidyaka* of Jayadatta and of Dīpaṅkara, the *Yoga-mañjarī* of Vardhamāna and the *Aśvacikitsā* of Nakula are extant works on the science of horses.

#### Architec- ture

The literature on Architecture is represented by the *Vāstuvīdyā*, the *Manuṣyālaya-candrikā* in seven chapters, the *Mayamata*

in *thirty-four* chapters, the *Yuktikalpataru* in *twenty-three* chapters, the *Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra* of Bhoja, the *Viśvakarma-prakāśa* and some sections of the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, the *Matsyapurāṇa*, the *Agnipurāṇa*, the *Garuḍapurāṇa*, the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, the *Kāśyapasaṃhitā*, the *Śilparatna* of Śrikumāra and such other works.

The science of jewels has been discussed in such works as the *Agastimata*, the *Ratnaparīkṣā* of Buddhabhaṭṭa and the *Navaratnaparīkṣā* of Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita.

**Science of  
Jewels**

Mention may be made of the *Sanmukha-kalpa*, a treatise on the science of stealing.

**Science of  
Stealing**

Mention should also be made of the *Nalopākṣa* which treats of the art of cooking.

**Science of  
Cooking**

On music there have been many important works besides the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Among the more important works on this subject, mention may be made of the *Saṅgītamakaranda*, the *Saṅgītasudarśana* of Sudarśana, the *Saṅgītaratnākara* of Śaraṅgadeva, the *Saṅgītadarpaṇa* of Dāmodara and the *Rāgavibodha* of Somanātha.

**Science of  
Music**

On dancing the literature is not very extensive. Besides the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, we have the *Abhinayadarpaṇa* of Nandikeśvara,

**Science of  
Dancing**

the *Śrīhastamuktāvalī*, the *Nartananirṇaya* and a few other works.

**Science of  
Painting**

On painting the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, of uncertain date, contains a chapter.

#### REFERENCES

- Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
Weber, A. : The History of Indian Literature.
-

# CHAPTER TWENTY

## PHILOSOPHY

### A

#### ORTHODOX SYSTEMS

The Nyāya system which represents the analytic type of philosophy like the Vaiśeṣika system, has a long history that extends over the vast period of twenty centuries. Indian tradition has assigned a unique status to this system and it has been universally held in high esteem and reverence.

There are two well-known schools of the Nyāya system and they are the old and the new. The earliest known literature of the old school are the Nyāyasūtras of Gautama which are divided into five books. It is believed that the Nyāyasūtras are as old as the third century B.C.<sup>1</sup> Vātsyāyana's

I  
Nyāya

Introduc-  
tion

Works on  
Nyāya :  
(a) Old  
school

<sup>1</sup> Dr. S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa believes that Gautama wrote only the first chapter of the work, and was a contemporary of Buddha. He further thinks that this Gautama is the same as the author of the *Dharma-sūtras*, who lived in Mithilā in the sixth century B.C. He suggests that Gautama's original views are contained in the *Carakasamhitā* (*Vimānasthāna*). But the *Carakasamhitā* itself has suffered considerable re-

*Nyāyabhāṣya* is the most important commentary on the *Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama and it is presumed that the work was written before 400 A.D. Vātsyāyana's views were vehemently criticized by Dignāga, the famous Buddhist logician, whose probable date is not later than the fifth century A.D. Uddyotakara wrote his *Nyāyavārttika* in the sixth century A.D. with the sole object of defending Vātsyāyana against the criticisms of Dignāga. It was Dharmakīrti, another noted Buddhist logician, who took up the cause of Dignāga and wrote his *Nyāyabindu* in the latter part of the sixth century A.D. Probably Uddyotakara and Dharmakīrti were contemporaries

fashioning and its date is uncertain. Professor Jacobi believes that the *Nyāyasūtras* and the *Nyāyabhāṣya* belong to about the same time perhaps separated by a generation. He places them between the second century A.D. when the doctrine of Śūnya developed, and the fifth century A.D. when the doctrine of Vijñāna was systematized. Professor Suali also supports Professor Jacobi and refers the work to 300 A.D. According to Professor Garbe the date is 100 A.D. MM. Haraprasāda Śāstrin believes that the work has undergone several redactions. Professor Radhakrishnan places it (though not in the present form) in the fourth century B.C.

who mutually referred to each other. A commentary on the *Nyāyabindu* was written in the ninth century by the Buddhist logician Dharmottara. It was in the first half of the ninth century A.D. that Vācaspati, a versatile genius and most prolific writer, came to write his *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭīkā*, a super-commentary on the *Nyāyavārttika* of Uddyotakara and gave a sufficient stimulus to the orthodox line of thought by writing his *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* (841 A.D.) and *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. Udayana who is noted for his trenchant logic and convincing presentation of facts, wrote a commentary on Vācaspati's *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭīkā*, known as the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāpariśuddhi* in the last part of the tenth century (984 A.D.). The *Nyāyakusumāñjali*, the *Āmatattvaviveka*, the *Kiraṇāvalī* and the *Nyāyapariśiṣṭa* are four other well-known works of Udayana. Jayanta is the next great name after Udayana and he wrote the *Nyāyamañjarī* in the tenth century A.D. He is admitted to have been a Bengali by origin. Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyasāra* is a survey of Indian logic. The author was a Kāśmir Saivite of the tenth century A.D.

Gaṅgeśa is the father of the new school

**Works on  
Nyāya :  
(b) New  
school**

of the Nyāya system (Navyanyāya) which flourished mainly in Bengal. His *Tattvacintāmaṇi* is a *magnum opus* which was written in the last quarter of the twelfth century A.D. The work discusses primarily the *four* means of knowledge admitted in the Nyāya system. His son Vardhamāna (1225 A.D.) continued the tradition by writing commentaries on the treatises of Udayana and Gaṅgeśa. Jayadeva (sometimes identified with Pakṣadhara Miśra) of Mithilā wrote his *Āloka* on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* in the latter part of the thirteenth century A.D. Vāsudeva Sārva-bhauma, a Bengali Brāhmaṇa, wrote his *Tattvacintāmaṇivyākhyā*—the first great work of the Navadvipa (Nadia) school. He had at least three distinguished pupils: Śrī-Caitanya Mahāprabhu, the famous Vaiṣṇava saint and founder of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava school, Raghunātha Śīromaṇi, the great logician and Kṛṣṇānanda Āgama-vāgiśa, the author of the *Tantrasāra*. Raghunātha wrote two outstanding works, viz, the *Didhiti* and the *Padārthakhaṇḍana* in the fifteenth century A.D. Jagadīśa (end of the sixteenth century A.D). and Gadādhara (seventeenth century A.D.) are reputed

thinkers of the modern school, who wrote beside many commentaries, the *Śabdaśakti-prakāśikā* and the *Vyāptipañcaka* respectively. Viśvanātha's *Nyāyasūtravṛtti* (1634 A.D.) is another important work.

The logicians of the old school recognize *sixteen* categories while those of the modern school who have been greatly influenced by the Vaiśeṣika system, reduce them to *seven* only. The logicians of both schools accept *four* means of proof, viz., perception (*pratyakṣa*) inference (*anumāna*) analogy (*upamāna*) and verbal testimony (*śabda*). They do not admit of the self-manifestation of a cognition. Like the Vaiśeṣika, the Nyāya regards the world as a composite of external, unchangeable and causeless atoms. The soul in the Nyāya system is a 'real substantive being' which has certain qualities. The God (Īśvara) is the Supreme Spirit or the Universal Soul who acts as the Creator of the universe in the capacity of an efficient cause (*nimittakāraṇa*), while the atoms are the material cause (*upādānakāraṇa*). A true knowledge (*tattvajñāna*) of the categories leads to the liberation (*mukti*) of the soul in bondage, and the liberated soul is essentially conscious.

**Funda-  
mental  
concepts  
of Nyāya**



## II Vaiśeṣika

### Introduc- tion

The Vaiśeṣika system which is also called the Aulukya philosophy, is closely akin to the Nyāya system. It is, however, presumed that the earliest extant literature of this system is older than what is available in the Nyāya system. Thus while the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* of Kaṇāda (Kaṇabhakṣa, Kaṇabhuk or Kāśyapa) and the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* of Praśastapāda, evince no influence of the Nyāya system, the *Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama and the *Bhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana betray the fact that they have been greatly influenced by the views of the Vaiśeṣika system.

### Works on Vaiśeṣika

The *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* of Kaṇāda which are of unknown date but are generally assigned to a date which is later than 300 B.C., received additions from time to time. They are divided into *ten* books. The work of Praśastapāda which is generally regarded as a commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* may be viewed as an original contribution to the Vaiśeṣika system. Praśastapāda is usually assigned to the end of the fourth century A.D., though Dr. Keith makes him later than Dignāga, but earlier than Uddyotakara. There are *four* noted commentaries on the work of Praśastapāda and they are

(1) the *Vyomavatī* by Vyomaśivācārya alias Vyomaśekhara or Śivāditya (of unknown date, probably of the ninth century A.D.), (2) the *Nyāyakandalī* by Śrīdhara (last part of the tenth century A.D.), (3) the *Kiraṇāvalī* and the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* by Udayana (last part of the tenth century A.D.) and (4) the *Nyāyalīlāvatī* by Śrīvatsa or Vallabha (probably towards the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century A.D.). Śaṅkara's *Upaskāra* (latter half of the fifteenth century A.D.) is one important commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* of Kaṇāda. Laugākṣi Bhāskara's *Tarkakaumudī* is another work based on Praśastapāda's treatise.

Among manuals belonging to both Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika systems of Indian philosophy, may be mentioned Śivāditya's *Saptapadārthī* (eleventh century A.D.) Varadarāja's *Tārkkikarakṣā*, Keśavamīśra's *Tarkabhāṣā* (thirteenth or fourteenth century A.D.), Annambhaṭṭa's *Tarkasaṁgraha* and *Dīpikā* (sixteenth or seventeenth century A.D.), Jagadīśa's *Tarkāmṛta* (1635 A.D.) and Viśvanātha's *Bhāṣāpariccheda* or *Kārikāvalī* (seventeenth century A.D.) and its famous commentary *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* by him-

**Manuals of  
Nyāya &  
Vaiśeṣika**

self. Jayanārāyaṇa's (seventeenth century A.D.) *Vivṛti* is another important compendium of the Vaiśeṣika school.

**Funda-  
mental  
concepts of  
Vaiśeṣika**

The Vaiśeṣika system which in broader details agrees with the Nyāya, accepts *six* categories to which a *seventh* was added later on. It recognizes only *two* means of knowledge, viz., perception and inference. It does not accept verbal testimony as an independent means of proof, but as one included in inference. Both the Vaiśeṣika and the Naiyāyika are advocates of what is known in philosophical terms as Asatkāryavāda (the doctrine of the creation of the non-existent effect) and Ārambhavāda (the doctrine of initiation which makes the universe an effect newly produced from the eternal atoms). In the state of liberation, the soul in Vaiśeṣika conception retains no consciousness (*jñāna*), while in the Nyāya view the released soul is conscious.

**III  
Sāṅkhya**

**Introduc-  
tion**

The Sāṅkhya system is universally believed to be the oldest of the existing systems of Indian philosophy. The Sāṅkhya views are found in the Upaniṣads, in the *Mahābhārata*, in the Law-books of Manu and in the medical works of Caraka and others. Indian tradition ascribes the

authorship of the system to the sage Kapila, an incarnation of Lord Viṣṇu. The successors of Kapila were Āsuri, Pañcaśikha, Gārgya and Ulūka. Professor Garbe makes Pañcaśikha a contemporary of the great Mīmāṃsist Śabarasvāmin (sometime between 100 A.D. and 300 A.D.). Chinese tradition ascribes the authorship of the *Saṣṭhī-tantra* to Pañcaśikha, while Vārṣaganya gets the same credit in other's opinion.

The *Sāṅkhyakārikā* is the earliest known work of the Sāṅkhya system. It is believed that Īśvarakṛṣṇa wrote this work in the third century A.D.<sup>1</sup> An important commentary on the *Kārikā* is that of Gauḍapāda.<sup>2</sup> The *Mātharavṛtti* is another commentary which is regarded by some to be the source of Gauḍapāda's commentary while others

**Works on  
Sāṅkhya**

<sup>1</sup> A Chinese tradition ascribes to Vindhyavāsin the writing of a work of Vārṣaganya. Professor Takakusu indentifies Vindhyavāsin with Īśvarakṛṣṇa. In that case the *Kārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa has an earlier basis. Guṇaratna, however, regards Vindhyavāsin and Īśvarakṛṣṇa as different. Īśvarakṛṣṇa was earlier than Vasubandhu who is now assigned to the fourth century A.D. The *Kārikā* was translated into Chinese by Paramārtha (sixth century A.D.)

<sup>2</sup> Whether he is the same as the author of the

assign a later date to it. Yet another commentary on the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* is the *Yuktidīpikā* which is wrongly ascribed to Vācaspati. The *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* of Vācaspati (middle of the ninth century A.D.) is a most popular work of this system. Another popular work is the *Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtra* which contains *six* chapters. The authorship of this work is attributed to one Kapila. But this Kapila cannot be identical with the founder sage of this system, for the work cannot but be assigned to such a late date as the fourteenth century A.D. ; since it is not referred to even in the *Sarva-darśanasamgraha* of Mādhava (fourteenth century A.D.). Aniruddha's *Sāṅkhyasūtravṛtti* which was composed in the fifteenth century A.D., is an important work commenting on the *Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtra*. But the *Sāṅkhyapravacanabhāṣya* of Vijñāna-bhikṣu, (sixteenth century A.D.) a commentary on the *Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtra*, is the most important work of the system. Vijñāna-bhikṣu wrote another work on Sāṅkhya known as the *Sāṅkhyasāra*.

*Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* cannot be decided, and some seek to place him in the eighth century A.D.

The Sāṅkhya system is essentially dualistic, inasmuch as it speaks of Puruṣa (Spirit) and Prakṛti (Matter) as the two Ultimate Realities. The fundamental position of this system is that 'cause' is the entity in which 'effect' lies in a subtle form. Thus this system advocates the doctrine of Satkāryavāda. The world is said to be the evolution of Prakṛti which is its material cause. Prakṛti has been described to be of the nature of equilibrium of the triple Guṇas, *sattva* (purity-stuff), *rajas* (passion-stuff) and *tamas* (inertia-stuff). Puruṣa is defined as Pure Spirit which is different from Prakṛti and Puruṣas are many in number. A Supreme Spirit (Īśvara) or God is not admitted to exist in so many words. The Sāṅkhya system acknowledges the authority of *three* means of knowledge, viz., perception, inference and verbal testimony.

**Fundamen-  
tal concepts  
of Sāṅkhya**

The Yoga and the Sāṅkhya systems are used as complementary aspects of one whole system. While the Sāṅkhya system signifies 'theory', the Yoga signifies 'practice'. In the Upaniṣads, the *Mahābhārata*, the Jaina and the Buddhist literatures, Yoga practices have been mentioned.

**IV  
Yoga**

**Introduc-  
tion**

The *Yogasūtras* of Patañjali form the

**Works on  
Yoga**

earliest extant literature on the Yoga system. The *Yogasūtras* are divided into *four* chapters known as *Samādhi* (Concentration), *Sādhana* (Practice), *Vibhūti* (Miraculous Powers) and *Kaivalya* (Emancipation). It was Vyāsa who, according to modern scholars, is said to have written a masterly commentary on the *Yogasūtras* about the fourth century A.D., though traditionally he is believed to be the same as the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Vācaspati wrote an interesting and learned gloss on the *Vyāsabhāṣya* known as the *Tattvavaiśārādī*. Nāgeśabhaṭṭa of the eighteenth century A.D., wrote another gloss on the *Vyāsabhāṣya* known as the *Chāyā*. Other important works on the Yoga system are the *Rājamārtanḍa* of Bhoja (eleventh century A.D.) and the *Yogavārttika* and the *Yogasārasaṅgraha* of Vijñānabhikṣu (sixteenth century A.D.). Vijñānabhikṣu criticizes Vācaspati and

<sup>1</sup> It is traditionally believed that Patañjali, the author of the *Yogasūtras* is the same person as the great grammarian of that name who wrote the *Mahābhāṣya* in the middle of the second century B.C. But there is no positive evidence to prove the identity and some modern scholars are positively against this

brings the Yoga system nearer to the philosophy of the Upaniṣads.

The Yoga system discusses how through methodical effort of concentration of mind we can attain perfection. It teaches us how to control the different elements of human nature both physical and psychical. The Yoga system explains fully the principles according to which 'the physical body, the active will and the understanding mind are to be harmonically brought under control'. This is technically known by the name Royal Yoga (Rājayoga). There is yet a magical side of Yoga (Haṭhayoga) which describes how to perform miracles of various nature. Too much indulgence in this Haṭhayoga serves as an obstacle to the attainment of real Perfection.

**Rājayoga &  
Haṭhayoga**

The Yoga system materially differs from the Sāṅkhya at least in one essential point, viz., that while the latter system does not explicitly speak anything of God, the former regards God as a third category besides

**Yoga &  
Sāṅkhya :  
comparison**

view. Bhoja in the introductory verses of the *Rājamārtanḍa* makes a suggestion to the effect that Patañjali (author of the *Mahābhāṣya*), Patañjali (author of the *Yogasūtras*), and Caraka (author of the *Carakasamhitā*) are identical.



Prakṛti and Puruṣa and holds that devotion to the Lord is also one of the means of Release (*Kaivalya*.)

The Pūrvamīmāṃsā, Karmamīmāṃsā or the Mīmāṃsā system mainly interprets and explains Vedic injunctions and their applications, and as such it has a unique importance of its own.

The earliest literature on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā are the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras* of Jainini who, according to modern scholars, wrote in all probability in the fourth century B.C. The orthodox tradition, however, makes Jainini a disciple of Vyāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. It is held by some that the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* are later than both the *Nyāyasūtras* and the *Yogasūtras*. Śābara wrote his commentary on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* probably in the first century B.C. Professor Jacobi thinks that the *Vṛtti* quoted by Śābara, belongs to a period between 200 A.D. and 500 A.D., while Dr. Keith holds 400 A.D. to be the earliest date for it. Śābara's predecessors were Upavarṣa, Bodhāyana, Bhartṛmītra, Bhavadāsa and Hari. MM. Sir Ganganath Jha identifies Bhavadāsa with the Vṛttikāra referred to in the *Śābarabhāṣya*. Both the *Mīmāṃsā*-

V  
Pūrvamīmāṃsā

Introduction

Works on  
Pūrvamīmāṃsā

*sūtras* and the *Bhāṣya* were interpreted differently by *three* different schools of thought associated with the names of Prabhākara, Kumārila and Murāri. The school of Murāri is known by name alone.

Prabhākara who was called 'Gauḍa-mīmāṃsaka' and 'Guru' wrote the *Br̥hatī* a commentary on the *Bhāṣya* of Śabara, probably about 600 A.D. According to some Prabhākara preceded Kumārila, while the tradition runs that he was a pupil of Kumārila. Śālikanātha's *R̥juvimalā* which is a commentary on the *Br̥hatī*, was written about the ninth century A.D. Another important work of the same author is the *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, a good and useful manual of the Prābhākara system. Śālikanātha has referred to Dharmakīrti. Bhavanātha's *Naya-viveka* (c. 1050 A.D.—1150 A.D.) is another important work of this school. Vācaspati in his *Nyāyakanīkā* differentiates between two sub-schools of the Prābhākaras, viz., old and new.

Kumārila is a great name in Indian philosophy, noted for his spirited zeal for Brāhmanical orthodoxy. It was he who fought courageously against the onslaughts of Buddhism, and but for the stand he took up, much of Brāhmanical heritage of which

**Prābhākara  
school**

**Bhāṭṭa  
school**

we feel proud today, would have been lost. Kumārila's *Śloka-vārttika*, *Tantra-vārttika* and *Tuṭṭikā* are the three great works. The first one, which is in verse, is a commentary on the first part of the first chapter of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras*. The second which is in prose, occasionally interspersed with verses, takes us to the end of the third chapter, while the third covers the rest. Kumārila is earlier than Śaṅkara and is usually assigned to 750 A.D., though some new data point to the fact that he lived in the seventh century A.D. The *Śloka-vārttika* was commented upon by Umbeka or Bhavabhūti (eighth century A.D.), by Sucaritamiśra (not later than the middle of the thirteenth century A.D.) in his *Kāśikā* and by Pārthasārathimiśra (according to the orthodox tradition, tenth century A.D.; according to Professor Radhakrishnan, 1300 A.D.) in his *Nyāyaratnākara*. The *Tantra-vārttika* was commented upon by Bhavadabhāṭṭa (eleventh century A.D.) in his *Tautātītamatatilaka* and by Someśvarabhāṭṭa (c. 1200 A.D.) in his *Nyāyasudhā*. Veṅkaṭa-dikṣita wrote his commentary on the *Tuṭṭikā* known as the *Vārttikābharaṇa*. Māṇḍana (eighth century A.D.) is the next great

name after Kumārila who is reported to be Maṇḍana's teacher and father-in-law. Maṇḍana who is earlier than Vācaspati and is traditionally identified with Sureśvara and Viśvarūpa, wrote his *Vidhiviveka*, *Bhāvanāviveka*, *Vibhramaviveka* and *Mīmāṃsānukramanī*.<sup>1</sup> The first was commented upon by Vācaspati in his *Nyāyakaṇikā*.

Among independent works on the Mīmāṃsā system, may be mentioned the *Śāstradīpikā* of Pārthasārathimiśra, the *Jaiminīyanyāyamālā* of Mādhava (fourteenth century A.D.), the *Upakramaparākrama* and the *Vidhirasāyana* of Appayyadiṣita, the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa* of Āpodeva (seventeenth century A.D.), the *Arthasaṃgraha* of Laṅkāśibhāskara (seventeenth century A.D.), the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*, the *Mīmāṃsākaustubha* and the *Bhāṭṭarahasya* of Khaṇḍadeva (seventeenth century A.D.), the *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi* of Gāgābhāṭṭa (seventeenth century A.D.), the *Mānameyodaya* of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (seventeenth century A.D.) and the *Mīmāṃsāparibhāṣā* of Kṛṣṇajñāna (eighteenth century A.D.). Rāmakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, author of the *Yukti-*

**Independent  
works on  
Mīmāṃsā**

<sup>1</sup> The *Sphoṭasiddhi* of Maṇḍana which explains the grammarian's doctrine of Sphoṭa is an important work.

*snehaprapuraṇā*, Somanātha, author of the *Mayūkhamālikā*, Dinakarabhaṭṭa and Kama-lākarabhaṭṭa belong to the Bhāṭṭa school.-

Important  
concepts of  
Mīmāṃsā

The Pūrvamīmāṃsā system recognizes the self-validity of knowledge. Jaimini accepts only *three* means of knowledge—perception, inference and verbal testimony. To these *three* Prabhākara adds *two* more, viz., comparison (*upamāna*) and implication (*arthāpatti*). Kumārila also recognizes non-apprehension (*anupalabdhi*) as a means of knowledge.) It is generally believed that the Pūrvamīmāṃsā has not accorded any significant status to God, though, in the *Vedāntasūtras*, Jaimini has been represented as theistic in his views.<sup>1</sup>

VI  
Vedānta

Introduc-  
tion

The Uttaramīmāṃsā, Brahnamīmāṃsā or the Vedānta is the most popular of all orthodox systems of Indian philosophy. The earliest teachers of the school were Āśmarathya, Bādari, Kārṣṇājīni, Kāśakṛtsna, Auḍulomi and Ātreya. These teachers along with Jaimini are mentioned in the *Vedāntasūtras*.

Scholars differ with regard to the age when the *Vedāntasūtras* or the *Brahmasūtras*

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to the Pūrvamīmāṃsā, Dr. Pashu-patinath Shastri, pp. 132-8.

of Bādarāyaṇa were composed. Modern Indian scholars are inclined to assign as early a date as the sixth century B.C., while others would prefer to fix the date between 400 B.C. and 200 A.D.<sup>1</sup>

The *Vedāntasūtras* contain four chapters. The first discusses the Brahman as the Ultimate Reality. The second deals with objections raised by rival schools of philosophy. The third proposes to study the means of attaining Brahmanavidyā, while the fourth discusses the results of Brahmanavidyā. The *Vedāntasūtras* are in intimate agreement with the teachings of the Upaniṣads. As such Bādarāyaṇa has evinced his great and abiding reverence for the Vedas. Unlike the Sāṅkhya, the Vedānta

**The  
Vedānta-  
sūtras**

<sup>1</sup> The orthodox Indian tradition makes the author identical with Vyāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Śaṅkarācārya, however, does not clearly state anywhere that Vyāsa (or, Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana born as an incarnation of the Vedic sage Apāntaratamas by the direction of Lord Viṣṇu) was the author of the *Brahmasūtras*. He calls this author invariably as Bādarāyaṇa and never as Vyāsa and does not explicitly say that the two are identical. But Vācaspati, Ānandagiri, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Vallabha and Baladeva identify Bādarāyaṇa with Vyāsa.

of Bādarāyaṇa champions the cause of monism when he holds that it is the One Brahman which is the Transcendent Reality. Bādarāyaṇa openly refutes the Sāṅkhya doctrine which conceives Puruṣa and Prakṛti as two independent entities. The conception of Māyā as the illusory principle which shuts out the vision of the Brahman and reflects *It* as many, is a great contribution to the philosophical thought of the world. The world exists so long as the vision of the Brahman does not dawn upon us. While the Sāṅkhya maintains that the world is an evolution (*pariṇāma*) of Prakṛti, the Vedānta holds that the world is an appearance (*vivarta*) of the Brahman.

**Early  
teachers of  
Vedānta**

Among the early teachers of Vedānta mention must be made of Gauḍapāda who in his famous *Kārikās* has made a systematic treatment of the monistic Vedānta. Another important author is Bhartṛhari (probably belonging to the first part of the seventh century A.D.) who is said to have written a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. Yet another author hinted at by Śaṅkara is Bhartṛprapañca according to whom the Brahman is at once, one and dual. Besides him Śaṅkara speaks of one

Vṛttikāra, who remains even now unidentified.<sup>1</sup>

The greatest of all thinkers on monistic Vedānta is Śaṅkara who, according to Professor Max Müller and other modern scholars, wrote his immortal *Śārīrakabhāṣya* during 788 A.D.—820 A.D. The orthodox tradition, however, assigns him to the latter half of the seventh century A.D. (686 A.D.—720 A.D.). Besides the philosophical insight which marks his writings, his style and diction have always lent a unique distinction to them. Śaṅkara has written commentaries on the *ten* major Upaniṣads and his commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* has, in particular, attracted the attention of many an able thinker. Śaṅkara's expositions have earned for him a distinction which may be described in this way that by the expression Vedānta we seem invariably to understand his views on it.

Śaṅkara :  
age &  
works

The *Śārīrakabhāṣya* was commented upon by *two* schools of thought known as

<sup>1</sup> Whether he is the same as Upavarṣa, a brother of Varṣa, the teacher of Pāṇini, or Bodhāyana, or whether the two sages are identical, or whether there was a third author who passed as Vṛttikāra, cannot be definitely ascertained.



**Vivaraṇa  
school**

the Vivaraṇa school and the Bhāmatī school. The original source of the former school is found in the *Pañcapādikā* of Padmapāda who is said to have composed the commentary on the *first five quarters* (pādas) of the *Brahmasūtra-sārīrakabhāṣya* of which only the commentary on the *first four* Sūtras are now available. The age of Padmapāda is about the end of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century A.D., as he is represented as the senior-most disciple of Śaṅkara. The *Vivaraṇa* which is a gloss on the *Pañcapādikā*, was composed by Prakāśātman (probably, ninth century A.D.; 1200 A.D. according to Professor Radhakrishnan). According to him the Brahman is both the content (*viśaya*) and the locus (*āśraya*) of Māyā. Vidyāraṇya who is generally identified with Mādhava (fourteenth century A.D.), wrote a summary on the *Vivaraṇa* known as the *Vivaraṇaprameyasamgraha*.

**Bhāmatī  
school**

The Bhāmatī school has been well represented in the *Bhāmatī* of Vācaspati, the *Kalpataru* and the *Śāstradarpaṇa* of Amalānanda (thirteenth century A.D.) and the *Parimala* of Appayyadikṣita (sixteenth—seventeenth century A.D.).

The literature on monistic Vedānta, as

interpreted by Saṅkara, is extremely rich. Sureśvara (who is traditionally identified with Maṇḍana who later became a disciple of Śaṅkara), wrote his *Taittirīyopaniṣad-bhāṣyavārttika*, *Bṛhadāraṇyakabhāṣyavārttika* and *Naīṣkarmyasiddhi* about the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century A.D.<sup>1</sup> Maṇḍana's *Brahmasiddhi* is an outstanding work in which he puts forward many original ideas. The *Samkṣepasārīraka* was written in verse by Sarvajñātmamuni in the ninth century A.D. The *Iṣṭasiddhi* of Avimuktātman (or Vimuktātman) is another notable work of the school. In 1190 A.D. Śrī-Harṣa who is noted for his trenchant logic and Advaita polemics, composed his *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*—a masterly contribution. In the thirteenth century A.D. Citsukha wrote on the same lines his *Pra-tyaktattvapradīpikā* or *Citsukhī*. In the fourteenth century A.D. Vidyāraṇya wrote his *Pañcadaśī*, a highly popular work in verse, and the *Jīvanmuktiviveka*, a work of considerable importance. Vidyāraṇya and his teacher Bhāratīrtha jointly wrote the

<sup>1</sup> Some would rather place him in the first half of the ninth century A.D.

*Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā*. The *Vedāntasāra* of Sadānanda, is a good manual of monistic Vedānta. It was composed in the fifteenth century A.D. Another epistemological manual on monistic Vedānta is the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* which was composed by Dharmarājādharīndra in the sixteenth century A.D. His son Rāmakṛṣṇa (sixteenth—seventeenth century A.D.) wrote the commentary *Śikhāmaṇi* on it. Ānandagiri's *Nyāyanirṇaya* (fourteenth century A.D.) and Govindānanda's *Ratnaprabhā* (fifteenth century A.D.) are two other commentaries on Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. Prakāśānanda's *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* (fifteenth century A.D.) and Appayyadikṣita's *Nyāyarakṣamaṇi* and *Siddhāntaleśasaṁgraha* are other valuable manuals of the monistic school. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, a Bengali of the sixteenth century A.D., wrote his monumental work the *Advaitasiddhi* which contains an intricate and abstruse criticism of the rival school of Madhva as represented in the *Nyāyāmṛta* of Vyāsatīrtha or Vyāsarāja (last part of the fifteenth century A.D.). The *Gauḍabrahmānandī* or *Laghucandrikā* of Brahmānanda, is a defence of the *Advaitasiddhi* against the criticism of Rāmācārya.

(alias Rāmatīrtha or Vyāsarāma) in his *Taraṅgiṇī* (latter part of the sixteenth century A.D.).

The *Brahmasūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa have been differently interpreted by a number of great thinkers of different schools, all of whom wrote their works after Śaṅkara. One such thinker was Bhāskara who wrote his *Bhāṣya* sometime about the end of the eighth or the first part of the ninth century A.D. Bhāskara was a champion of the doctrine of the simultaneous identity and difference (Bhedābheda-vāda).

**Schools of  
Vedānta**  
(i) **Bhāskara**

Rāmānuja is another great commentator on the *Brahmasūtras* whose age is assigned to the eleventh century A.D. His philosophy is based on the doctrine of qualified monism (Viśiṣṭādvaitavāda) according to which God is the one Reality, but is a composite of the conscious individual selves and the non-conscious material world. Rāmānuja's chief sources of inspiration were the Tāmil Gāthās of the Ālvāras or Vaiṣṇava saints of South India, the chief of them being Nāthamuni and Yāmuna-cārya (tenth century A.D.). The name of his commentary is the *Śrībhāṣya*. The *Śrutaparakāśikā*

(ii) **Rāmā-  
nuja**

of Sūdarśana (thirteenth century A.D.) is a well-known gloss on the *Śrībhāṣya*. Veṅkaṭa-nātha Vedāntadeśika (thirteenth century A.D.) was perhaps the greatest successor of Rāmānuja. He was the author of the *Śatadūṣaṇī*, the *Tattvaṭīkā* (a commentary on the *Śrībhāṣya*) and the *Seṣvaramīmāṃsā*.

(iii) Nim-  
bārka

Nimbārka is another commentator on the *Brahmasūtras*. His commentary is called the *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha*. He advocates the doctrine of dualistic non-dualism (Dvaitādvaitavāda) which is somewhat akin to the view of Bhāskara with but minor technical differences. Nimbārka lived about the eleventh century A.D. His disciple Śrīnivāsācārya wrote a commentary known as the *Vedāntakaustubha*. Keśavakāśmīrin, a follower of this school (fifteenth century A.D.), wrote a commentary on the *Gītā* known as the *Tattvapraṇāśikā*.

(iv) Madhva

One more commentator on the *Brahmasūtras* is Madhva who was born in 1199 A.D. Besides the commentary he wrote, he justified his interpretation in another work called the *Aṇuvyākhyāna*. He advocates the theory of pure dualism (Dvaitavāda).

Yet another commentator is Vallabha who lived in the last part of the fifteenth

century and the first part of the sixteenth century A.D. His commentary is called the *Aṇubhāṣya*. The theory he advocates is pure non-dualism (Śuddhādvaitavāda). He looks upon the world as a reality which is in its subtlest form the Brahman.

Last, though not the least, is the school of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas who advocate the doctrine of inscrutable identity and difference (v) **Gauḍīya** (Acintyabhedābheda-vāda). Though they call themselves a branch of the Mādhva school yet in views they are more akin to the school of Nimbārka and sometimes follow Śāṅkara also. The school traces its origin to the teachings of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Caitanya who flourished in Bengal in the sixteenth century A.D. In the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava school, Rūpa-gosvāmin, a contemporary and disciple of Śrī-Caitanya, was a great versatile scholar who wrote many works on drama, rhetoric and philosophy. His *Vaiṣṇavatoṣiṇī*, a commentary on the tenth chapter of the *Bhāgavata*, is an important contribution to the literature of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas. His nephew and disciple Jīva-gosvāmin also was a great scholar and a prolific writer. His six *Sandarbhās* (*Kramasandarbhā*, *Tattvasandarbhā*, *Bhaktisandarbhā*, etc.) and

the *Sarvasamvādinī* are outstanding works on Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava philosophy. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa (eighteenth century A.D.) wrote the *Govindabhāṣya*, the commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, written according to the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava point of view. His *Prameyaratnāvalī* is also a popular work.

## B

## HETERODOX SYSTEMS

I  
BuddhismIntroduc-  
tion

The Buddhists are the followers of Gotama Buddha who preached his doctrines in the language of the people sometime in the sixth and the fifth centuries B.C. The Buddhist Canonical literature or the *Tipiṭaka* which was written in Pāli, has *three* divisions: (1) the *Vinayapīṭaka*, (2) the *Suttapīṭaka* and (3) the *Abhidhammapīṭaka*. Besides the Canonical works, the Buddhist literature possesses a rich number of non-Canonical works which were also written in Pāli. It must be mentioned here that the Buddhist literature has a still wider scope and it includes fairly a long list of Sanskrit works an account of which has already been set forth in a previous chapter.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chap. V, pp. 51-75.

The Buddhist philosophers are broadly divided into the *four* schools—the Sautrāntikas, the Vaibhāṣikas, the Mādhyamikas and the Yogācāras. Like Jainism, Buddhism also does not accept the authority of the Vedas. The Buddhists acknowledge only *two* means of knowledge—perception and inference. Though there are sharp lines of demarcation among the *four* schools referred to above, they are unanimous in their attitude against Brāhmaṇic culture. I-tsing, the Chinese traveller, says—Those who worship the Bodhisattvas and read the Mahāyānasūtras are the Mahāyānists and those who do not perform such acts, are the Hinayānists. The Mahāyānists are divided into *two* branches—(1) Mādhyamika and (2) Yogācāra. The Hinayānists also have *two* divisions—(1) Vaibhāṣika and (2) Sautrāntika. Both are called Sarvāstivādins.

**Four  
schools of  
Buddhism**

The Vaibhāṣikas reject the authority of the Sūtras and attach themselves to the *Vibhāṣā*, the commentary on the *Abhidharma*. Kātyāyaniputra's *Jñānaprasthāna* (composed about three hundred years after Buddha's Nirvāṇa) is their chief work. The commentary *Mahāvibhāṣā* was compiled by five hundred Arhats led by Vasumitra, pro-

(i) **Vaibhā-  
ṣika**



bably after the great council under Kanīṣka. Fragments of *Udānavagga*, *Dhammapada*, *Ekottarāgama*, Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* and Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* seem to belong to this school. Bhadanta (third century A.D.) Dharmatrāta and Ghosaka are other prominent exponents of this school.

(ii) Sautrān-  
tika

According to Hiuen Tsang (Yuan Chwang) Kumāralāta (or Kumāralabdha), a contemporary of Nāgārjuna, was the founder of the Sautrāntika school. The Sautrāntikas derive their name from the fact that they take their stand on the Sūtras. To be precise, unlike the Vaibhāṣikas, they adhere to the *Suttapiṭaka*, (the section consisting of the discourses of Lord Buddha) to the rejection of the two other Piṭakas. It is unfortunate that all works of this school are no longer extant. Dharmottara, the logician, and Yaśomitra, the author of the commentary on Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*, are said to be the followers of this school.

(iii) Mādhy-  
amika

The founder of the Mādhyamika school was Nāgārjuna who is said to have written the *Śatasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*, the latest of the Mahāyānasūtras. It may be mentioned in this connection that the *Prajñāpāramitās* declare that the highest wisdom consists of

the knowledge of Void (*Śūnyatā*). The most representative work of the Mādhyamika school is the *Mādhyamikakārikā* or the *Mādhyamikasūtra* of Nāgārjuna which consists of *four hundred* verses in *twenty-seven* chapters. Nāgārjuna wrote a commentary of his own work, which is named the *Akutobhaya*. Unfortunately the work has not come down to us in Sanskrit. Among other works written by Nāgārjuna are the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, the *Śūnyatā-saptati*, the *Pratītyasamutpādaḥṛdaya*, the *Mahāyānaviṃśaka* and the *Vigrahavyāvartanī*. Nāgārjuna is usually placed between the first century B.C (according to the tradition preserved in the archives of the Dalai-Lama) and the fourth century A.D. (according to Dr. S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa). In any case he cannot be later than 401 A.D., when Kumārajīva translated his life into Chinese. Śāntideva (seventh century A.D.), the author of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, is named sometimes as a Mādhyamika and sometimes as an advocate of the Yogācāra doctrine. The commentary named the *Prasannapadā*, written by Candrakīrti in the sixth or the seventh century A.D., is an important contribution to the Mādhyamika literature. Āryadeva who

is a disciple of Nāgārjuna, wrote the *Catuṣ-  
ṣataka* which is another important work of  
the Mādhyamika school. It was commented  
on by Candrakīrti. Other works by Āryadeva  
are the *Cittariśuddhiprakaraṇa*, the *Hasta-  
rālaprakaraṇa* and two other small treatises  
constituting a kind of commentary on some  
sections of the *Laṅkāvatāra*.

(iv) Yogā-  
cāra

The founder of the Yogācāra school was  
Maitreya-nātha, the teacher of Asaṅga who  
is generally believed to have clearly expressed  
the implications of his system. Asaṅga is  
at least as late as the third century A.D.,  
though some would place him in the fourth  
or the fifth century A.D. According to the  
Yogācāra school nothing exists beyond  
consciousness (*viññāna*). The *Abhisamayā-  
lāṅkāra-kārikās* and probably the text of the  
*Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* attributed by Pro-  
fessor Lévi to Asaṅga and the *Yogācāra-  
bhūmiśāstra*, a prose work after the  
manner of the *Abhidharma* text, are the  
works of Maitreya-nātha.<sup>1</sup> Aśvaghōṣa

<sup>1</sup> The name of Asaṅga has become more famous  
than that of his teacher Maitreya-nātha. This explains  
why the works of the latter are attributed to the  
former. According to the Tibetans and Hiuen Tsang  
the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* has been ascribed to Asaṅga.

was a follower of the Yogācāra school who wrote among other works the *Mahāyānaśraddhotpādasūtra* as detailed in a previous chapter.<sup>1</sup> Vasubandhu Asaṅga is a great name in Buddhist literature who is assigned to the fourth century A.D., though some place him in the fifth century A.D. His work the *Abhidharmakośa* in six hundred verses which has not reached us in the Sanskrit original, is a lasting contribution to Buddhist philosophy. In this work the author has refuted chiefly the views of the Vaiśeṣikas. The Sāṅkhya theory has been criticized in his *Paramārthasaptati*. Yaśomitra wrote a commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* known as the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, the earliest translation of which into Chinese was done in the sixth century A.D. The work is highly important as it enables us to know the views of the Vaibhāṣikas and the Sautrāntikas. Vasubandhu wrote his monumental treatise, the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* consisting of two works the *Viṃśatikā* and the *Trīṃśikā* which explain the doctrine of the reality of consciousness. A few other works, viz., *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*, the *Vyākhyāyukti*,

<sup>1</sup> Ch. V. p. 66

the *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* and two commentaries on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* and the *Pratītyasamutpādasūtra*, the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and the *Aparimitāyussūtropadeśa* are said to have been written by Vasubandhu. Among the adherents to the school of Vasubandhu mention must be made of Sthiramati, Dignāga, Dharmapāla and Śīlabhadra. Sthiramati wrote a commentary on Vasubandhu's *Trīṃśikā-Vijñapti* while Dharmapāla had a commentary on the *Vīṃśatikā-Vijñapti*. Dignāga was the disciple of Vasubandhu, brother of Ārya Asaṅga. Dignāga's date also is not accurately fixed. Thus while some assign him to the fifth century A.D., others place him between 520 A.D. and 600 A.D., and make him a contemporary of Guṇaprabha, the teacher of King Śrī-Harṣa of Kanauj. Mallinātha, the famous commentator of the fifteenth century A.D., seems to find a reference to this Dignāga in Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, *Pramāṇasāstrapraveśa* and other works are preserved in Tibetan translations, and are very popular in Japan. The only Sanskrit work of Dignāga which has recently come down to us is the *Nyāyapraveśa*. Dharmakīrti (sixth or

seventh century A.D.) wrote a valuable work—the *Nyāyabindu* which was commented on by Dharmottara (ninth century A.D.) in his *Nyāyabinduṭṭkā*. Śīlabhadra (seventh century A.D.) was the head of the Buddhist Vihāra at Nālandā and Yuan Chwang (Hiuen Tsang) acquired from him his knowledge of Buddhist philosophy. Śāntarakṣita in the eighth century A.D. wrote a voluminous work, the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, in which he has criticized the views of many rival schools of philosophers. His work was commented on by Kamalaśīla in his *Pañcikā*.<sup>1</sup>

The Jainas are the followers of Jina which is a title applied to Vardhamāna, the last prophet. Vardhamāna said that he was the expounder of tenets that had been successively held by *twenty-three* earlier sages. The Jainas are divided into *two* schools : (1) Śvetāmbara (white-robed) and (2) the Digambara (sky-robed or nude). We are told that this division took place as early as the first century A.D. The

II  
Jainism

Two schools

<sup>1</sup> A late treatise on the Buddhist philosophy is the work of Advayaavajra who is assigned to the close of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century A.D.

Śvetāmbara Jainas possess both Canonical and philosophical works, while the Digambara Jainas have no Canonical literature. The Canonical literature of the Śvetāmbara sect comprises *eighty-four* books among which *forty-one* are Sūtras. Both the schools disregard the authority of the Veda and are, therefore, called heterodox schools of philosophy by the orthodox Hindu philosophers.

(i) Digam-  
bara

The earliest Digambara author who is also held in high esteem by the Śvetāmbara sect, is Kundakunda whose works are all written in Prākṛit. The first known Digambara writer in Sanskrit, is Umāsvāmin, also called Umāsvāti (third century A.D.) whose *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* (in *ten* chapters) is regarded as an authoritative text by both sects. Siddhasena Divākara is also a well-known Digambara philosopher who wrote probably in the fifth century A.D. His commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* and his two other works the *Nyāyāvātāra* and the *Sammatitarkasūtra* are all important contributions. In the first half of the eighth century A.D., Samantabhadra, a Digambara, wrote a commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* which contains an

introduction called the *Āptamīmāṃsā* which was known both to Kumārila and Vācaspati. Samantabhadra's other works are *Yuktyanuśāsana* and *Ratnakāraṇḍaśrāvakācāra*. To the same century, in all probability, lived Akalaṅka among whose works the *Tattvārtharājavārttika* and the *Aṣṭaśatī*, commentaries on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* and the *Āptamīmāṃsā* respectively, may be mentioned. His views were strongly opposed by Kumārila. It was Vidyānanda who defended Akalaṅka against the criticisms of Kumārila by writing the *Aṣṭasāhasrī*, the *Tattvārthaslokavārttika*, the *Āptaparīkṣā*, the *Patraparīkṣa* the *Pramāṇaparīkṣā* and the *Pramāṇanirṇaya*. Māṇikyanandin wrote his *Parīkṣāmukhasūtra* which is based on the *Nyāyaviniścaya* of Akalaṅka. Prabhācandra who is said to be a pupil of Kundakunda, wrote two independent works on logic, the *Prameyakamalamārtanḍa* and the *Nyāyakuṃudacandrodaya*. It is usually believed that Prabhācandra was a pupil of Akalaṅka, but it is stated in the epilogue of the *Prameyakamalamārtanḍa* that the work was composed during the reign of Bhoja of Dhārā. Śubhacandra is another Digambara Jaina who wrote his



*Jñānārṇava*, a philosophical work in verse, at the close of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century A.D.

(ii) Svetām-  
bara

Haribhadra is the earliest Śvetāmbara Jain philosopher who wrote two important works, the *Saḍdarśanasamuccaya* and the *Lokatattvanirṇaya*, besides a commentary on the *Nyāyapraveśa* of Dignāga, the *Yogaḍṛṣṭisamuccaya*, the *Yogabindu* and the *Dharmabindu*. His date is believed to be the ninth century A.D. Towards the close of the ninth century A.D. Amṛtacandra wrote the *Tattvārthasāra* and the *Puruṣārthasiddhyupāya* besides a few commentaries. Hemacandra is a great Jain philosopher whose *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* is an important work on Jain philosophy. Malliṣeṇa in the thirteenth century A.D. wrote his *Syādvādamāñjarī*, a commentary on Hemacandra's *Anyayogavyavacchedikā*. To the same century belongs Āśādhara among whose works mention should be made of the *Dharmāmṛta*. Devendrasūri, another writer of the same century, wrote the *Siddhapañcāśikā*, the *Vandāruvṛtti* and the *Upamītibhavaprapañcā-kathā-sāroddhāra*. In the fifteenth century Sakalakīrti wrote a voluminous work the *Tattvārthasāradīpaka* in twelve

chapters. To the same century belonged Śrutasāgara who wrote the *Jinendra-yajñavidhi* and the *Tattvārthadīpikā*. In the seventeenth century flourished Yaśovijaya who wrote the *Jñānabīnduprakaraṇa* and the *Jñānasāra*.

The substance of the doctrine of the Indian materialists is aptly and very briefly summed up in the allegorical drama, the *Prabodhacandrodaya*—‘Lokāyata is the only Śāstra. In this system perceptual evidence is the only authority. The elements are four in number—earth, water, fire and wind. Wealth and enjoyment are the objects of human existence. Matter can think ; there is no other world. Death is the end of all.’ ‘Lokāyata’ (directed to the world of enjoyment through senses) is the Sanskrit expression for materialism. It is the name of the Śāstra. The materialists are called Lokāyatikas or Cārvākas called as such after the name of the founder of the school.

Cārvāka’s story is found in the *Mahābhārata* while the doctrine is referred to in the *Mahābhārata* (*Śalyaparvan* and *Śānti-parvan*), the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and the *Manu-smṛti*, as that of the Nihilists and the

III  
Materialism  
(Cārvāka)

Introduc-  
tion

References  
to Cārvāka  
philosophy

Heretics. Sometimes Cārvāka is identified with Br̥haspati, who incarnated himself as an atheist in order to bring ruin unto the demons. The classic authority on the materialist theory is said to be the *Sūtras* of Br̥haspati, which have perished. The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* of Mādhava gives a summary of the teaching of the school in its first chapter. Fragmentary quotations of Sūtras and passages from works of the school now lost to us, can be traced in the polemical works of other philosophical schools.

**Early  
teachers**

Among the earlier heretical teachers, mention may be made of Sañjaya the sceptic, Ajita Keśakambalin the materialist, Purāṇa Kāśyapa the indifferentist, Maskarin Gosāla the fatalist and Kakuḍa Kātyāyana the elementalist.

**Schools of  
Materialism**

The materialists, again, were subdivided into several schools—those who identified the body with the self, those who confused the self with the external senses, those who regarded the internal organ (*antaḥkaraṇa*) as their self and so on. The oft-quoted verses quoted by Mādhava, give a popular view of the materialists—“While the life remains, let a man live happily ; let him feed on

ghee, even if he runs in debt ; when once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever return again ?” “The three authors of the Vedas were the hypocrites, knaves and night-prowlers”, etc., etc.

(‘

### MISCELLANEOUS WORKS ON PHILOSOPHY

*Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* by Śrīkaṇṭha alias Nilakaṇṭha (thirteenth or fourteenth century A.D.).—written from the Viśiṣṭaśiva-dvaita point of view - much in the same line as that adopted by Rāmaṇuja.—commented on by Appayyadīkṣita in his *Śivārka-maṇḍīpikā* (It is said that Appayya was at first a Śaivaite and later was converted into an Advaitin.)

*Śrīkarabhāṣya* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* by Śrīpati Paṇḍita representing the Dvaitādvaita point of view.

*Commentaries on the Gītā (named Subodhinī), the Bhāgavata, and the Viṣṇupurāṇa :* by Śrīdharaśvamin (twelfth or thirteenth century A.D.)—who is claimed to be an exponent of the Śuddhādvaita school, inasmuch as he refers to

Viṣṇusvāmin. the founder of the Śuddhādvaita school in the commentary on the *Bhāgavata*. [Vallabhācārya (fifteenth-sixteenth century A.D.) was a later exponent of this school. But as he has also referred to Citsukha, it may also be possible that he was a thinker of the Advaita school, who was rather inclined to the doctrine of Devotion (*Bhakti*). This sort of compromise between the doctrines of Devotion (*Bhakti*) and Knowledge (*Jñāna*). is also found later in the *Bhaktirasāyana* of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī who was a sturdy champion of the Advaita philosophy.]

*Sarvadarśana-  
saṅgraha*

by Mādhvacārya who along with his brother Sāyana, the celebrated commentator of Vedic literature, was in the court of Kings Harihara and Vira Bukka of Vijayanagara (fourteenth century A.D. and subsequently turned a Sannyāsin and passed his days in the Śringerī Maṭha.—a valuable encyclopaedia of Indian philosophy, which contains the summary of the views of at least *seventeen* different orthodox and heterodox schools of Indian philosophy.

*Sarvasiddhānta-sārasaṅgraha* ascribed to Śaṅkaracarya but seems to be the work of a more modern hand who was possibly one of the later chiefs of the Śaṅkara Matha—a work in the line of the *Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha* though written in easy verses.

*Vijñānāmṛtabhāṣya* by Vijñānabhikṣu (sixteenth century A.D.) who by writing this commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* tried to make in the body of this work a sort of compromise between the Sāṅkhya and Yoga views on one hand and the Vedāntic (Upaniṣadic) views on the other.

*Śaktibhāṣya* by Pañcanana Tarkaratna of the twentieth century A.D. —an ingenious work in the form of a commentary on the *Brahmsūtras*. It does not, however, strictly conform to the orthodox Śaṅkara-gama standpoint.

### REFERENCES

- Das Gupta, S. N. History of Indian Philosophy, Vols. I, II & III.  
 Keith, A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature.  
 Radhakrishnan, S. Indian Philosophy, Vols. & II.  
 Winternitz, M. : A History of Indian Literature, Vol. II.



## APPENDIX

### HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF SANSKRIT IN THE WEST

It was in the seventeenth century that the European people, particularly missionaries and travellers, came to know of the Indian languages. In 1651 A. D. Abraham Rozer published a Portugese translation of Bhartṛhari's poems. In 1699 A. D. the Jesuit Father Johann Ernst Hanxleden came to India and after getting himself acquainted with the Sanskrit language wrote the first Sanskrit grammar in a European language. The book, however, was not printed but was consulted by Fra Paolino de St. Bartholomeo who wrote two Sanskrit grammars besides a number of important works. It was during the administration of Warren Hastings that the work called 'Vivadarnavasetu' was compiled. Under the title 'A Code of Gentoo Law' it was published in English in 1776 A. D. Nine years later, the *Bhagavadgītā* was translated into English by Charles Wilkins who also rendered into English the *Uṭopadeśa* and the Śakuntalā episode of the *Mahābhārata*. It was, however, Sir William Jones who did most to arouse the interest of Europeans in Indian literature / In 1789 A. D. he published his English translation of Kālidāsa's *Śākuntalā*, and this was followed by his translation of the *Manusmṛti*, the most important legal literature of ancient India. It was again through his enthusiasm that the *Rtusamhāra* of Kalidāsa was published in the original text in 1792 A. D. The English translation of Kālidāsa's works by Sir William Jones was followed by the German translation of *Śākuntalā* by Georg Forster in 1791 which attracted the attention of men like Herder and Goethe. The work of Jones was followed up by Henry Thomas Colebrooke who



published 'A Digest of Hindu Law on Contracts and Successions' based on a composition in Sanskrit by orthodox Indian scholars. He also edited a number of Sanskrit works including the *Amarakoṣa*, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Hitopadeśa* and the *Kirātārjunīya*. Another Englishman who studied Sanskrit in India was Alexander Hamilton who, while returning to England in 1802 A. D., was imprisoned with other Englishmen at Paris under orders of Napoleon Bonaparte. During the period of his imprisonment Hamilton trained up a band of European scholars who took to the study of Sanskrit with earnest zeal. This is commonly referred to as the 'Discovery of Sanskrit' in the West. One of Hamilton's most distinguished students was the great German scholar and poet Friedrich Schlegel, who wrote that epoch-making work 'On the Language and Wisdom of the Indians'. This work introduced for the first time the comparative and the historical method. It also contained translations in German of many passages from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Bhagavadgītā*, the *Manusmṛiti* and other early works. Friedrich Schlegel's brother August Wilhelm von Schlegel, student of Professor A. L. Chézy, the first French scholar in Sanskrit, not only contributed much to the study of Comparative Philology but also helped the study of Sanskrit by editing texts and writing translations. One of Schlegel's students was Christian Lassen who was deeply interested in Indian culture. The science of Comparative Philology was founded by Franz Bopp, a student of Professor Chézy and contemporary of August Wilhelm. Bopp also rendered great service to the investigation of Sanskrit literature by incorporating in his work "Conjugations-System" translations from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. His Sanskrit Grammars considerably furthered the study of Sanskrit in Germany. The work of Bopp in the domain of Comparative Philology was developed in a most comprehensive manner by Wilhelm von Humboldt whose interest in the philosophical works of the

Indians was of an abiding character. Another noted German, Friedrich Ruckert, was also highly interested in Indian poetry. The Latin translations of the Upaniṣads in the beginning of the nineteenth century inspired German philosophers. Schelling, Kant, Schiller, and Schopenhauer were highly charmed to discover "the production of the highest human wisdom". (The actual investigation of Vedic literature was first undertaken by Friedrich Rosen in 1838) and was subsequently continued by a band of illustrious students of the great French Orientalist Eugène Burnouf, including Rudolf Roth and F. Max Müller, who brought out his famous *editio princeps* of the *Ṛgveda* with the commentary of Sayana in the years 1849-75. One of Roth's distinguished students was H. Grassmann who published a complete translation of the *Ṛgveda*. It was during this period that Horace Hayman Wilson who came to Calcutta represented the orthodox interpretation of the *Ṛgveda* by translating it on the lines of Sayana's commentary. Similar work was done by Alfred Ludwig, who is looked upon as a forerunner of R. Pischel, and K. F. Geldner, the joint authors of 'Vedic Studies'. The name of Theodor Aufrecht is also associated with Vedic investigations.

The publication of the great St. Petersburg Dictionary (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch) in 1852 is an important event in the history of progressive studies in Sanskrit in the West. The Dictionary was compiled by Otto Bohtlingk and Rudolf Roth and published by the Academy of Fine Arts and Sciences, St. Petersburg. 'The History of Indian Literature' which was published by Albrecht Weber in 1852 A. D. and was edited for the second time in 1876 A. D., is another important work. The edition of the *Śatapathabrahmaṇya* by the same author is another outstanding contribution. The 'Catalogus Catalogorum' published by Theodor Aufrecht in the years 1891, 1896, and 1906, forms a most comprehensive list of Sanskrit authors and works and is a monumental work of its kind.

Arthur Anthony Macdonell's 'Vedic Grammar' and 'Vedic Mythology' and the 'Vedic Index' by Macdonell and Arthur Berriedale Keith, have all proved helpful works for the study of Sanskrit in Europe. Maurice Bloomfield's 'Vedic Concordance' is another great work which has been of immense help to Vedic studies in the West. William Dwight Whitney's 'Sanskrit Grammar' is yet another important treatise. Edward Byle Cowell, who was Principal, Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, gave a distinct fillip to Sanskritic studies by his translations of the *Sarva-darśanasamgraha* and many other important Sanskrit works. Arthur Venis, Principal, Government Sanskrit College, Benares, also did a lot to help Sanskritic studies. Amongst European scholars who lived in India and took interest in Sanskrit learning and literature, mention may be made of J. F. Fleet, Vincent A. Smith, Sir Alexander Cunningham, Sir John H. Marshall, Sir M. A. Stein, Sir George Grierson and J. Fergusson. )

Among later European scholars who have done invaluable service to the cause of Sanskrit studies, the names of George Bühler, J. Muir, Frank Kielhorn, E. Roer, H. Luders, Hermann Jacobi, E. Senart, Sylvain Lévi, Edward Washburn Hopkins, E. Hultzsch, Arthur Coke Burnell, Monier Williams, Theodor Goldstucker, Richard Garbe, Paul Deussen, Julius Eggeling, George Thibaut, Julius Jolly, and Maurice Winternitz are remembered by all lovers of Sanskrit )

( Of living western indologists, the more important names include F. W. Thomas, A. B. Keith, L. D. Barnett, T. Tscherbatsky, Sten Konow, Vallée Poussin, Otto Strauss, C. R. Lanman and Giuseppe Tucci. /

## INDEX

- Abhayānandin, 155.  
*Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*, 174.  
*Abhidhānaratnamālā*, 174.  
*Abhidharmakośa*, 71, 221, 226-7.  
*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, 227.  
*Abhidhāvṛttimātrkā*, 165.  
*Abhiññānaśakuntala*, 97, 108.  
 Abhinanda, son of Jayanta, 85.  
 Abhinanda, son of Śātānanda, 86.  
*Abhinavabhārati*, 163, 165.  
 Abhinavagupta, 46, 75n, 161, 163, 165, 167.  
*Abhinayadarpaṇa*, 193.  
*Abhisamayālaṅkārakārikā*, 71, 226.  
*Abhiṣeka*, 102.  
 Acintyābhedābhedavāda, 221.  
*adbhuta*, 75n  
*Adbhutadarpaṇa*, 117.  
*Adbhutasāgara*, 191n.  
*Ādipurāṇa*, 85.  
*Advantasiddhi*, 218.  
 Advayaavajra, 229n  
*Ādyā Śakti*, 13.  
*Agastimata*, 193.  
*Agnipurāṇa*, 42, 161n, 171, 173.  
*Ahīrbudhnyasamhitā*, 46.  
 Aihole inscription, 81.  
 Aiyer, G., 53.  
 Ajita Keśakambalin, 234  
 Akalaṅka, 231.  
*Ākhyāyikā*, 136-7.  
*Aksobhyaviyūha*, 69.  
*Akutobhaya*, 70, 225  
*Ālīkārūṇī*, 32n, 188  
 Alexander, 89.  
 Alaṅkāra, 154, 161-2, 66.  
*Alaṅkārakāṇḍa*, 81.  
*Alaṅkārasaṅgraha*, 161.  
*Alaṅkārasarvasva*, 167.  
*Alaṅkāraśekhara*, 169.  
*Āloka*, 198.  
*Ālīkāras*, 219.  
 Amalananda, 217.  
 Amaraśandra, 87, 168  
*Amarakośa*, 173, ii.  
*Amaramaṅgala*, 117.  
 Amarasiniha, 136, 173-74.  
 Amaru, 123.  
*Amaruśataka*, 123.  
 Amitagati, 127.  
*Amoghavṛtti*, 155.  
*Amṛtabhārati*, 157.  
 Amṛtācandra, 232.  
*Amṛtamanthana*, 89  
 Amṛtananda, 61.  
*Anandabhairava*, 46  
 Anandagiri, 213n, 218.  
*Anandalaharī*, 127.  
 Anandavardhana, 83, 111, 124, 126-7, 161, 164-65, 167.  
 Anāṅgaharṣa Matraraṇa, 114.  
*Anaṅgarāṅga*, 183.  
 Ananta, 147  
*Anargharaghava*, 112.  
*Anekārthasaṅgraha*, 174.  
*Anekārthasamuccaya*, 174.  
 Aniruddha, *Putṛdayitā*, 178.  
 Aniruddha, Com. on *Sāṅkhya-sūtra*, 204.  
 Āṅka, 97, 102.  
 Annambhatta, 201.  
*Āṇubhūṣya*, 221.  
 Āṇubhūtiśvarūpacārya, 156.  
*Āṇuvyākhyāna*, 220.  
*Anyayogavyavacchedikā*, 232

- Anyoktimuktālatāsataka*, 127.  
*Āpāntaratamas*, 213n.  
*Āparimūṭyussūtropadeśa*, 228.  
*Āpastamba*, 175.  
*Āpiśali*, 147.  
*Āpodeva*, 211.  
*Appayyadikṣita*, 169, 211, 216, 218, 235.  
*Āptamīmūṃsū*, 231.  
*Āptaparīkṣā*, 231.  
*Ārambhavāda*, 202.  
*Arisimha*, 133, 168.  
*Ārjunarāvaṇīya*, 85  
*Arjunavarman*, 124.  
*Arthasaṃgraha*, 211.  
*Arthaśāstra*, 99, 143, 180.  
*Ārya Asaṅga*, 71, 226, 226n, 228  
*Āryabhata*, 188-9  
*Āryabhata*, *Āryasiddhānta*, 188.  
*Āryabhaṭīya*, 188.  
*Āryadeva*, 71, 225  
*Āryāsaptati*, 127.  
*Āryasiddhānta*, 188  
*Āryūśāsata*, 188.  
*Āryaśūra*, 68, 146, 224.  
*Āśādihara*, 232.  
*Asatkāryavāda*, 202.  
*Āścariya-upapurāṇa*, 43  
*Āśmarathya*, 212.  
*Aśoka*, 53, 74.  
*Aśokāvadāna*, 73  
*āśrama*, 41  
*āśraya*, 216  
*Aśṭādhyāyī*, 2, 20, 149, 149n, 150, 152-3, 158, ii.  
*Aśṭamahāśrīcātyastotra*, 126.  
*Aśṭāṅgasāṃgraha*, 185.  
*Āśvacikitsā*, 192  
*Āśvaghoṣa*, 49, 57, 59, 60, 65, 65n, 66n, 67, 71, 77, 99, 100, 100n, 224, 226.  
*Āśvavaidyaka*, 192.  
*Āśvāyurveda*, 192.  
*Atharvaveda*, 33, 88, 134, 187  
*Ātmataṭṭvaviveka*, 197.  
*Ātreya*, ritual authority, 184  
*Ātreya*, authority on medicine, 212.  
*Aucityavivāda*, 166  
*Audulomi*, 212  
*Aufrecht*, T., iii.  
*Avadāna*, 65, 72-3.  
*Avadānakalpalatā*, 74n  
*Avadānaśataka*, 73-4, 85  
*Avaloka*, 166.  
*Avimūraka*, 104.  
*Avimuktātman*, 217  
*Bādarāyaṇa*, 212, 213n, 214, 219.  
*Bādari*, 212  
*Bāhudantiputra*, 180.  
*Balabhārata*, Amaracandra, 87.  
*Bālabhārata*, Bhāsa, 112.  
*Bālacarita*, 103, 105  
*Baladeva*, 213n, 222.  
*Bālaṃānoraṃā*, 153  
*Bālarāṃāyaṇa*, 112  
*Bālasubrahmaṇyaṃ I.R.*, 78n  
*Balibandha*, 99.  
*Ballīlāsena*, 145.  
*Baṇabhaṭṭa*, 34, 38, 85, 100, 109, 109n, 116, 120, 125-6, 138-9, 140-1, 146-7.  
*Banerji*, R. D., 61n, 62n.  
*Barnett*, L. D., iv.  
*Bauddhasāṃgatyalāṅkāra*, 138.  
*Bhadanta*, 224.  
*Bhadrakalpivādāna*, 74  
*Bhagavadgītā*, 114.  
*Bhagavadgītā*, i.  
*Bhāgavata*, 42, 135, 221, 236.  
*Bhakti*, 169, 236.  
*Bhaktirasāyaṇa*, 236.

- Bhaktiśataka*, 128  
 Bhallata, 127.  
*Bhallataśataka*, 127.  
 Bhāmaha, 82, 137, 152, 161-2  
*Bhāmatī*, 216.  
*Bhāminīvilāsa*, 128  
 Bhāṇa, 97, 115.  
 Bhandarkar R. G., 61n.  
 Bhāṇika, 98  
 Bhanudatta, 168  
 Bhānuji, 173  
 Bharata, 17, 75n, 88, 160-1,  
 163, 165, 168  
*Bharatacampū*, 147  
 Bharatacandra, 124.  
*Bhāratamañjarī*, 86  
 Bharavi, 81, 83  
 Bhartṛhari, 82, 122-3, 127-8,  
 151, 154, 214, 1.  
 Bhartṛmeṭṭha, 84.  
 Bhartṛmitra, 208  
 Bhartṛprapañca, 214  
 Bhasa, 97, 99, 100-1.  
*Bhāṣapariśeṣa*, 201  
 Bhāsarvajña, 197  
*Bhāṣāvṛtti*, 158.  
*Bhāskara-upapurāṇa*, 43  
 Bhāskara, *Unmattarāghava*, 117  
 Bhāskara, philosopher, 219-20  
 Bhaskaracarya, 189  
*Bhāscālī*, 189.  
*Bhaṣya*, Bhaskara, 219  
*Bhāṭṭācintāmaṇi*, 211  
*Bhāṭṭādīpikā*, 211.  
 Bhāṭṭanārayaṇa, 111-2.  
 Bhāṭṭanāyaka, 164  
*Bhāṭṭarahasya*, 211.  
 Bhāṭṭi, 82, 85-6, 137, 151.  
*Bhāṭṭikāvya*, 76n, 81, 137, 157.  
 Bhāṭṭoji, 153-4, 159.  
 Bhāṭṭotpala, 190.  
 Bhaumaka, 85  
 Bhavabhūti, 90, 92, 97, 109-12,  
 111.  
 Bhavadāsa, 208.  
 Bhavadevabhāṭṭa, 177, 210.  
*bhūvakatra*, 164  
 Bhavamiśra, 156  
 Bhavanātha, 209.  
*Bhūvanāvivēka*, 211  
*Bhūvaprakāśa*, 186.  
*Bhūvaprakāśana*, 167  
 Bhavendrasuri, 87.  
*bhayanaka*, 75n.  
 Bhayabhāṣṇaśarman, 191n.  
 Bhedaśbedavada, 219  
 Bhela, 185.  
*Bhikkhupācittīya*, 3.  
*Bhikkhupacittīya*, 3  
 Bhimaṭa, 114  
 Bhita medallion, 78n  
 Bhoja, 166-7, 181, 189, 193,  
 206, 207n.  
 Bhojadeva, 124, 231.  
*bhojakatra*, 164.  
*Bhojaprabandha*, 145.  
 Bhojaraja, 147  
 Bhoḡu, 176.  
*bībhatsa*, 75n  
*Bijagaṇita*, 189.  
 Bilhaṇa, 114, 124, 131.  
*Bilvamaṇḡala*, 127  
*Bimbumatī*, 98  
 Bloomfield M., iii.  
 Bodhāyana, 208, 215n.  
 Bodhāyanakavi, 114.  
*Bodhicaryāvatāra*, 225.  
 Bohtlingk, O., iii.  
 Bopp, F. ii.  
 Brahmadaṭṭa, 56.  
 Brahmagupta, 188, 189.  
 Brahmananda, 224.  
*Brāhmaṇasarasva*, 178.  
*Brahmaṇḡlapurāṇa*, 42.

*Brahmapurāṇa*, 42.  
*Brahmasiddhi*, 217.  
*Brahmasphutasiddhānta*, 188.  
*Brahmasūtra*, 135, 212, 213n,  
 214, 219-20, 222, 235.  
*Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, 218.  
*Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, 42.  
*Bṛhacchabdenduṣekhara*, 154.  
*Bṛhadāraṇyakabhāṣyavārttika*,  
 217.  
*Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, 215.  
*Bṛhajjātaka*, 190.  
*Bṛhaspati*, 180, 234.  
*Bṛhaspatismṛta*, 177.  
*Bṛhadbrahmasaṁhitā*, 46.  
*Bṛhatī*, 209.  
*Bṛhatkathā*, 101, 104, 142-3.  
*Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, 142.  
*Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, 190, 193.  
*Buddha*, 53-8, 63, 65, 195n,  
 222-4.  
*Buddhabhaṭṭa*, 193.  
*Buddhacarita*, 57, 60, 63, 65,  
 77, 78n, 224.  
*Buddhaghoṣa*, 84.  
*Buddhāvataṁsaka*, 70.  
*Budhasvāmin*, 142.  
*Bühler*, G., 1, 5, 5n, 7, 8, 122n,  
 176, iv.  
*Burnell*, A. C., 149n, iv.  
*Burnouf*, E., iii.  
*Caitanyacandrodaya*, 116.  
*Caitanyāmṛta*, 158.  
*Cakrapāṇidatta*, 185.  
*Campakaśreṣṭhikathānaka*, 145.  
*Cānakya*, 143, 180, 184.  
*Caṇḍakauśika*, 113.  
*Caṇḍeśvara*, 178, 181.  
*Caṇḍī*, 42.  
*Caṇḍidāsa*, 167.  
*Caṇḍīśataka*, 126.  
*Candra*, *Candraka*, 114.

*Cāndra school*, 155.  
*Candragomin*, 114, 152, 154-5.  
*Candrakīrti*, 72n, 225-6.  
*Candrāloka*, 168-9.  
*Caraka*, 135, 184-5, 202, 207n.  
*Carakasaṁhitā*, 184, 195n, 207n.  
*Cārucaryūśataka*, 127.  
*Cārudatta*, 104-5.  
*Cārvāka*, 233-4.  
*Catalogus Catalogorum*, iii.  
*Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, 178.  
*Caturvargasaṁgraha*, 127.  
*Catuśśataka*, 71, 226.  
*Catuśśatakastotra*, 67.  
*Caurapañcāśikā*, 124.  
*Chandomañjarī*, 172.  
*Chando'nuśāsana*, 172  
*Chāyā*, 206.  
*Chézy*, A. L., ii.  
*Cidambara*, 87.  
*Cikitsūkalkikā*, 186.  
*Cikitsūsārasaṁgraha*, 185.  
*Citrabhārata*, 115.  
*Citramīmāṁsā*, 169.  
*Citsukha*, 217, 236  
*Citsukhī*, 217.  
*Cittaśuddhiprakaraṇa*, 71, 226.  
*Colebrooke*, T., 158, i.  
*Conjugations-system*, ii.  
*Cowell*, E. B., iv.  
*Cunningham*, A., 9, 10, 53, iv.  
*Dalai-Lama*, 225.  
*Ḍallana*, 185.  
*Dāmodara*, 193.  
*Dāmodaragupta*, 126.  
*Dāmodaramiśra*, 113.  
*Daṇḍin*, 4, 9, 105n, 136-8, 142, 162-3.  
*Darpadalana*, 127.  
*Daśabhūmaka*, 70.  
*Daśagitikāsūtra*, 188.  
*Daśakarmapaddhati*, 178.  
*Daśakumāracarita*, 105n, 137.

- Daśarathajātaka*, 27.  
*Dattakasārvāśraya*, 83.  
 Davids, R., 9.  
*Dūyabhāga*, 178.  
 Deussen, P., iv.  
 Devaprabhasūri, 87.  
 Devendrasūri, 232.  
 Devesvara, 168.  
*Devīpurāṇa*, 43.  
*Devīmahādeva*, 98.  
*Devīmāhātmya*, 42.  
*Devīśataka*, 126.  
 Devotional, 169.  
*Dhammapada*, 224.  
 Dhanañjaya, 166.  
 Dhanapāla, 147.  
 Dhaneśvara, 86.  
 Dhanika, 166.  
*Dharmābhyudaya*, 114.  
*Dharmabindu*, 232.  
 Dharmakīrti, 67, 72n, 138, 196, 209, 228.  
*Dharmāmṛta*, 232.  
 Dharmapāla, 72, 228.  
*Dharmaparīkṣā*, 127.  
 Dharmarājadhvarīndra, 218.  
*Dharmaratna*, 178.  
*Dharmasaṃgraha*, 71.  
*Dharmasarmābhyudaya*, 86.  
*Dharmasūtra*, 1, 175, 195n.  
 Dharmatrāta, 224.  
 Dharmottara, 72n, 197, 224, 229.  
*Dhātupāṭha*, 155.  
*Dhātupradīpa*, 158.  
*Dhātuvṛtti*, 158.  
 Dhavalacandra, 144.  
 Dhiranaga, 115.  
 Dhīrodatta, 76, 96.  
 Dhoyī, 125.  
*Dhūrtasamāgama*, 116.  
 Dhvani, 161, 164, 166-9.  
*Dhvanyāloka*, 161, 165.  
*Dīdhiti*, 198.  
 Digambara, 229, 230, 231.  
 Dignāga, 72, 115, 196, 200, 228, 232.  
 Dīpa, 97, 115.  
 Dinakarabhaṭṭa, 212.  
*dīpa*, 73.  
*Dīpakalikā*, 178.  
 Dīpaṅkara, 192.  
*Dīpikā*, 201.  
*Dīvyāvadāna*, 52, 73.  
 Dīrghabala, 184.  
 Dsanglun, 73.  
 Dubreuil, J., 61n, 62n.  
 Durgasiṃha, 156.  
*Durghatavṛtti*, 158.  
 Durlabharaja, 191n.  
 Durmallika, 98.  
*Dūtaghaṭṭakaca*, 102.  
*Dūtākāvya*, 125.  
*Dūtāṅgada*, 116.  
*Dūtavākya*, 102.  
*Dvādaśanikāyaśāstra*, 71.  
 Dvaitadvaita, 220, 235.  
 Dvaitavāda, 220.  
*Dvāvīṃśatyavadāna*, 74.  
*Dvyaśrayakāvya*, 132.  
*editio princeps*, iii.  
*Ekāślokaśāstra*, 71.  
*Ekāvali*, 168.  
*Ekottarāgama*, 224.  
 Eggeling, J., iv.  
 Elizabethan drama, 90.  
 Erotic, 95, 169.  
 Fergusson, J., 61n, 79n, iv.  
 Fleet, J. F., 60n, 80n, 106, iv.  
 Forster, G., i.  
 Frank, 60n.  
 Gadādhara, 198.  
 Gāgābhaṭṭa, 211.  
 Gajendragadkar, 122n.  
 Gālava, 149.  
 Gaṇa, 192.



- Gaṇapāṭha*, 155.  
*Gaṇaratnamahodadhī*, 158.  
*Gaṇḍistotragāthā*, 65  
*Gaṅgādāsa*, 172.  
*Gaṅgūlaharī*, 128  
*Gaṅgeśa*, 197-8.  
 Garbe, R., 196n, 203. iv.  
*garbha*, 95.  
*Gārgya*, 149, 203.  
*Garuḍapurāṇa*, 42, 193.  
*Gāthā*, 51, 58. 69.  
*Gāthāśaptasatī*, 120.  
*Gauḍa*, 110, 130  
*Gauḍabrahmānandī*, 218.  
*Gauḍapāda*, 203, 214.  
*Gauḍapūḍakīrikā*, 214.  
*Gauḍavaha*, 110, 130.  
*Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas*, 221, 222.  
*Gautama*, 175, 195, 195n, 196,  
 200  
*Gayadāsa*, 185.  
 Geldner, F., 93, iii.  
*Ghaṭākarpara*, 122.  
*Ghaṭākarparakāvya*, 122  
*Ghoṣaka*, 224.  
*Ghosh*, Aurobinda, 122n.  
*Girnar inscription*. 48.  
*Gītā*, 32, 220, 235.  
*Gītagovinda*, 125, 183.  
 Goethe, 106, 121, i  
*Gokulikas*, 54-5.  
 Goldstucker, T., 2, 149, iv.  
*Gopālacampū*, 147,  
*Gopendra Tippa Bhūpāla*. 163  
*Gopinātha*, 117.  
*Goṣṭhī*, 98.  
*Govardhana*, 127.  
*Govinda*, 167, 169.  
*Govindabhāṣya*, 222.  
*Govindānanda*, 218.  
*Govindarāja*, 177.  
 Grassmann, H., iii.  
*Gr̥hyasūtra*, 174.  
 Grierson, G., iv.  
*Guṇa*, 163.  
*Guṇabhadra*, 85, 168.  
*Guṇādhyā*, 101, 142  
*Guṇaprabha*, 228.  
*Guṇaratna*, 203n.  
*Hāla*, 120, 127.  
*Halāyudha*, 86, 174, 178  
*Hallīśa*, 98  
 Hamilton, A., ii.  
*Hammīramadamardana*, 116.  
*Haṁsadūta*, 121n.  
*Haṁsasandeśa*, 121n.  
*Harṇamānūṭaka*, 113.  
 Hanxleden, J. E., i.  
*Haradatta*, 152.  
*Haradattasūri*, 87  
*Harakelīnūṭaka*, 115.  
*Hārivalī*, 173  
*Haravṇaya*, 76n, 85.  
 Hari, 82, 208.  
*Haribhadra*, 232  
*Haricandra*, 86. 147.  
*Haridikṣita*, 159.  
*Harinūmāmṛta*, 158.  
*Hārīta*, 175.  
*Harivaṁśa*, 32, 99, 103.  
*Harivaṁśa*, court-epic, 87.  
*Harivaṁśapurāṇa*, 85.  
*Harivilāsa*, 86.  
*Harṣa*, 108-9, 109n, 140.  
*Harṣacarita*, 38, 109, 120, 140.  
*Harṣadeva*, 127, 132.  
*Harṣakīrti*, 191.  
*Hastabūlaprakaraṇa*, 226.  
*Hastyāyurveda*, 192.  
*hāśya*, 75n.  
*Hāsyacūḍāmaṇi*, 115.  
*Hāsyūṇava*, 117.  
*Hāṭhayoga*, 207.  
*Hayagrīvavadha*, 84.

- Hemacandra, 86, 127, 132, 155,  
 158, 167-8, 172, 174, 181,  
 232.  
 Hemādri, 43n, 178  
 Heroic, 95, 110  
 Herder, i.  
 Hertel, J, 93n  
 Hillebrandt, A., 92n  
 Hinayāna, 52, 56, 73  
 Hiranyakeśin, 175  
*Hitopadeśa*, 143, i, ii  
 Hiuen Tsang, 21, 224, 226n, 229  
 Hopkins, E. W., 36n, iv  
*Horū*, 190  
*Horūśūstra*, 190.  
*Horūśatapāñcāśikā*, 190  
*Hṛdayadarpaṇa*, 164  
 Hultsch, E., iv  
 Humboldt, W. von, ii.  
 Īhāmrga, 97, 115  
 Indra, 149n.  
 Indradhvaja, 88, 91  
 Introduction to Purvamīmāṃsa,  
 212n  
*Iśṣiddhi*, 217.  
*Īśvarakṛṣṇa*, 106, 203, 203n  
*Īśvarasamhitā*, 46.  
 I-tsing, 60, 151, 185, 223  
 Jacobi, H., 24, 26, 27n, 29, 35,  
 36, 196n, 208, iv  
 Jagaddeva, 191n  
 Jagadīśa, 198, 201.  
 Jagadīśvara, 117.  
*Jagatūcarita*, 133  
 Jagannātha, 128, 159, 169, 170.  
 Jaimini, 208, 212  
*Jaiminīyanyāyamālā*, 211.  
*Jaina-Mahābhārata*, 87  
*Jaina-Rāmāyaṇa*, 86  
 Jainendra, 155  
 Jaiyyaṭa, 185.  
 Jalhaṇa, 128.  
*Jāmbavatīvijaya*, 84  
*Janakīharaya*, 82.  
*Janakīpariṇaya*, 116  
*Jatukamālā*, 68, 146, 224.  
 Jayadatta, 192  
 Jayadeva, 124-5, 127, 183, 198.  
 Jayadeva, Berar, 115.  
 Jayadeva, *Candrāloka*, 168-9.  
 Jayaditya, 151, 152.  
*Jayamaṅgalā*, 182.  
 Jayanarayana, 202.  
 Jayanta, 85, 197  
 Jayaratha, 167  
 Jayasūnha, 116  
 Jha, Ganganath, 208.  
 Jimutavahana, 178  
 Jinadasa, 87  
 Jinakīrti, 145  
 Jinasena, *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*, 85.  
 Jinasena, *Mahapurāṇa*, 85.  
 Jinasena *Parśvabhyaṇa*, 85.  
 Jmendrabuddhi, 83, 152, 155.  
*Jinendrayajñavidhi*, 232.  
 Jivagosvamin, 58, 147, 169, 221.  
 Jivaka, 184  
*Jīvanudharacampū*, 149.  
*Jīvanmuktivivēka*, 217  
*Jñāna*, 236.  
*Jñānabinduaprakāṣaṇa*, 233  
*Jñānīmṛtasamhitā*, 46  
*Jñānaprasthāna*, 223.  
*Jñānīrghara*, 47, 232.  
*Jñānasara*, 233.  
*Jñānendrasarasvatī*, 153  
 Jolly, J., 27n, iv  
 Jones, W., 78n, 79n, 125, i.  
 Jumarānandin, 157  
 Jyotirīśvara, 182.  
*Jyotirvidyābhāṣaṇa*, 191.  
*Jyotisāsāroddhāra*, 191.  
*Kādambarī*, 138, 140.  
*Kādambarīkathāsāra*, 89.



- Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, Hemacandra, 167  
*Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, Vāgbhaṭa, 168.  
 Kedārabhaṭṭa, 179.  
 Keith, A.B., 99, 114, 143-4, 200  
 208, iii.  
*Keliravataka*, 98.  
 Kennedy, 60n.  
 Kern, H, 58-9, 69.  
 Keśavakūśmīrin, 220.  
 Keśavamīśra, rhetorician, 169.  
 Keśavamīśra, Naiyāyika, 201.  
 Khaṇḍadeva, 211.  
*Khaṇḍakhādya*, 188.  
*Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya*, 217  
 Kharoṣṭha, 8.  
 Kharoṣṭhi, 6, 7, 9.  
 Kielhorn, F., 122n, iv.  
*Kiraṇāvali*, 201.  
*Kirātārjunīya*, court-epic, 81, ii.  
*Kirātārjunīya*, drama, 115  
*Kīrtikaumudī*, 132.  
*Kīrtilatā*, 182.  
 Kokkoka, 182.  
 Konow, S, 60n, 62n, 106, 109n,  
 iv.  
 Korur theory 80n  
 Kramadīśvara, 157.  
*Kṛīḍarasūta*, 98.  
*Kṛṣṇakarmūrta*, 127.  
 Kṛṣṇamīśra, 113.  
 Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgīśa, 198.  
*Kṛṣṇa-yajurveda*, 134, 176.  
 Kṛṣṇa yajvan, 211.  
 Kṣemarāja, 46.  
 Kṣemendra, 74n, 84, 86, 115,  
 127, 142, 166, 172, 182.  
 Kṣemendra, grammarian, 157.  
 Kṣemīśvara, 113.  
 Kṣīrasvāmin, 173.  
*Kulacūḍāmaṇi*, 47,  
*Kulārṇava*, 47.  
 Kullūka, 177.  
 Kumāradāsa, 82.  
 Kumārajīva, 225  
 Kumāralabdha, 224.  
 Kumāralāta, 65n, 224.  
*Kumārasaṁbhava*, 78.  
 Kumārilabhaṭṭa, 34, 38, 209-10,  
 212, 231.  
 Kundakunda, 230-1.  
*Kundamūla*, 115.  
 Kuntaka, Kuntala, 166-7.  
*Kunteśvaradantya*, 84.  
*Kūmapurāṇa*, 42.  
*Kuśilava*, 99.  
*Kuṭṭānimata*, 126.  
*Kuvalayānanda*, 169.  
*Laghu Arhannīti*, 181.  
*Laghucandrika*, 218.  
*Laghujātaka*, 190.  
*Laghuśabdenduśekhara*, 154.  
*Laghuśiddhāntakaumudī*, 154.  
*lakṣaṇī*, 164.  
*Lakṣaṇīvali*, 201.  
 Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa, 147.  
 Lakṣmīdhara, 177.  
*Lalitāmūdhava*, 116.  
*Lalitavistara*, 52, 56-9, 63.  
*Laṅkāvatāra*, 70, 226.  
 Lanman, C R., iv.  
 Lassen, C , 29, 125, ii.  
 Lāśya, 88  
*Laṭakamelaka*, 115  
 Laugakṣibhaskara, 201, 211.  
 Levi, S., 7, 66, 109n, 125, 184,  
 226, iv.  
 Līlāsuka, 127.  
*Līlāvatī*, 189.  
*Līṅgānuśāsana*, 155.  
*Līṅgapurāṇa*, 42.  
*Locana*, 615.  
*Locanarocaṇī*, 169.  
 Lokānanda, 114.

- Lokatattvanirṇaya*, 232.  
*Lokāyata*, 233.  
*Lokeśvaratantra*, 123n.  
*Lokottaravādin*, 52, 54-5, 153.  
*Lolimbarāja*, 86, 186  
*Lollaṭa*, 64, 163  
*Luders*, 11, iv.  
*Ludwig*, A , iii.  
*Macdonell*, A., A.. 120, 123n,  
 125, iii.  
*Machiavelli*, 180.  
*Madālasācampū*, 146.  
*Madanapūrṇjīta*, 178.  
*Mādhava*, 158, 178, 204, 211,  
 216, 234, 236.  
*Mādhavasādhana*, 117.  
*Madhva*, 213n, 218, 220  
*Madhva school*, 221.  
*Mādhavakara*, 185.  
*Madhyamavyūyoga*, 97, 102.  
*Madhyamika*, 71, 71n, 72, 223-6.  
*Mādhyaṃikakārikā*, 70, 225  
*Madhyamikaśūti*, 225.  
*Madhyāntavibhāga*, 228.  
*Madhyasiddhāntakāumudī*, 154.  
*Madhusudana Sarasvatī*, 218,  
 236.  
*Magha*, 83, 85, 152.  
*Mahābhārata*, 26-7, 27n, 31-6,  
 36n, 37, 45, 75n, 81, 83, 85,  
 99, 101-2, 108, 112, 134, 143,  
 185, 202, 205-6, 208, 213n,  
 233, ii.  
*Mahābhāṣya*, 99, 135, 152, 206n,  
 207n  
*Mahādeva*, 117.  
*Mahānātaka*, 113.  
*Mahānīrvāṇa*, 47.  
*Mahāvastu*, 52, 55-6, 63.  
*Mahāprasthāna*, 75n.  
*Mahāpurāṇa*, 85.  
*Mahūrāja-Kanikalekha*, 68.  
*Mahāsāṅghika*, 53-4.  
*Mahāvagga*, 4.  
*Mahāvaiṃśa*, 53-4.  
*Mahāvīrācārya*, 189.  
*Mahāvīracarita*, 86, 110  
*Mahāvīrabhūṣā*, 223.  
*Mahāvīrastotra*, 127.  
*Mahāyāna*, 51-2, 56, 66, 68, 72.  
*Mahāyānaśraddhotpādasūtra*,  
 66, 227.  
*Mahāyānasūtra*, 68, 70, 223-4.  
*Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, 226,  
 228  
*Mahāyānavaiṃśaka*, 70, 225  
*Mahendravikramavarman*, 97.  
 109.  
*Maheśvara-upapurāṇa*, 43.  
*Maheśvara*, lexicographer, 174.  
*Mahimabhaṭṭa*, 166-7.  
*Mahimnaḥstotra*, 127.  
*Maithilīkalyāṇa*, 116.  
*Maitrāyaṇīya*, 176.  
*Maitreya-nātha*, 71, 226, 226n.  
*Maitreyarakṣita*, 158.  
*Maitreyasamiti*, 68  
*Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, 68.  
*Mālinīvijaya*, 46,  
*Mālinīvijayottaravārttika*, 46.  
*Mālatimadhava*, 97, 110  
*Mālavikā*, 97.  
*Mālavikāgnimitra*, 78n, 107, 109.  
*Mallakāmāruta*, 116.  
*Mallinātha*, 78, 152, 168, 228  
*Malliṣeṇa*, 232.  
*Mammāṭa*, 163, 167, 169.  
*Mānameyodaya*, 211.  
*Mānatuṅga*, 125-6.  
*Mānavadharmasūtra*, 175-6.  
*Maṇḍana*, 210-11, 211n., 217.  
*Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, 204n.  
*Māṇikyacandra*, 167.  
*Māṇikyānandin*, 231.

- Māṇkyasūri, 86.  
 Maṅkha, 86  
 Manu, 176-7, 187, 202,  
*Manusmṛti*, 135. 175-7, 233.  
*Manusyūlayacandrīkā*, 192.  
 Maskari Goṣāla, 234.  
*Maria Stuart*, 122.  
*Marici-upapurāṇa*, 43.  
*Mārkaṇḍeya*, 42.  
 Marshall, J. H., 60n, 62n, 78n,  
 iv.  
*Matanga*, 46.  
*Mataṅgalīlā*, 192  
 Mātṛcotā, 67-8  
 Mātṛgupta, 84  
*Matsyapurāṇa*, 41, 193  
*Mātharavṛtti*, 203  
*Mattavilāsa*, 97, 109.  
 Max Muller, F., 48, 53, 79n,  
 80n, 149, 215, iii.  
*Mayākapūhikā*, 98  
*Mayamata*, 192.  
 May-Pole, 91  
*Mayūkhamaṇīkā*, 212.  
 Mayūra, 123  
 Māyurāja, 114.  
 Mazumdar, R. C., 61n  
 Medhātithi, 135, 177  
 Medinikāra, 174  
*Meghadūta*, 79n, 85. 120. 125,  
 228.  
 Meghaprabhācārya, 114  
*Menakāhita*, 98  
 Merutuṅga, 133  
*Mīmāṃsūkautubha*, 211  
*Mīmāṃsūnukramayī*, 211  
*Mīmāṃsūnyanaprakāśa*, 211  
*Mīmāṃsūsūtra*, 135  
*Mitākṣarī*, 177.  
 Mitraniśra, 179.  
*Mohamudgara*, 126.  
*Moharājaparājaya*, 116  
*Mṛcchakaṭīka*, 104-5.  
*Mṛgāvatīcaritra*, 87.  
*Mṛgendra*, 46.  
*Mudrārākṣasa*, 111  
*Mudrītakumudacandra*, 115  
 Muir, J., iv  
*Mugdhabodha*, 157  
*mukha*, 95  
*Mukulabhaṭṭa*, 162n, 165  
 Murari, poet, 112  
 Murari, philosopher, 209  
*Nāgamanḍa*, 109  
 Nagaṛjuna, 59, 70. 10n, 71. 74n,  
 183, 185, 224-6  
 Nagaśabhaṭṭa, 153 154n, 159,  
 206  
*Naiśadhacarita*, *Naiśadhīya-*  
*carita*, 76n, 83  
*Naiśakarmyasiddhi*, 217.  
*Naiśrūsa*, 46.  
 Nakula, 192.  
*Nalacampū*, 146  
*Nalapūka*, 193  
*Namālīṇaṇaśasana*, 173  
 Namisādhu, 162  
 Nandana, 177  
 Nandikeśvara, authority on  
 dancing, 193  
*Nandikeśvara-upapurāṇa*, 43.  
*Nānadapurāṇa*, 42  
*Narasiṃhapurāṇa*, 43  
*Narada-smṛti*, 177  
*Narada-upapurāṇa*, 43.  
 Narayana, *Sahasasudhakarā*  
*campū*, 147.  
 Narayana, commentator on  
*Manusmṛti*, 177.  
 Nārāyaṇa, *Mataṅgalīlā*, 192  
 Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, *Mānamayo-*  
*daya*, 211.

- Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, *Vṛttaratnā-*  
*kara*, 172.  
 Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita, *Navaratna-*  
*parikṣā*, 193.  
 Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita, *Hitopadeśa*,  
 143.  
 Nariman, G. K., 58.  
*Nartananirṇaya*, 194.  
 Nāṭaka, 95, 97, 99, 102-4, 107-15.  
*Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*, 168.  
 Nāthamuni, 219.  
 Nāṭika, 98, 109, 113-4  
*Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, 168  
*Nāṭyarāsaka*, 98.  
*Nāṭyaśāstra*, 17, 78n, 88, 160,  
 165, 168, 171, 193.  
*Navaratnaparikṣā*, 193.  
*Navasūhasāṅkacarita*, 130.  
*Nayavivēka*, 209.  
*Neminirvāṇa*, 87.  
*netr*, 75.  
*Netra*, 46.  
*Nidāna*, 185.  
*Nighaṇṭu*, 173.  
*Nilakaṇṭha*, *Tājikā*, 191.  
*Nilakaṇṭha*, *Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya*,  
 235.  
*Nilamatapurāṇa*, 131.  
*Nimbarka*, 220-1.  
*Nirbhayaḥlūmavayāyoga*, 115.  
*Nirṇayasindhu*, 179.  
*Nītratinūhara*, 181.  
*Nītsūtra*, 122.  
*Nītvūkyūmrta*, 181  
*nirvahaṇa*, 95.  
*Nṛtyagopāla Kaviratna*, 117.  
*Nyāsa*, 83, 152.  
*Nyūyabhāṣya*, 196.  
*Nyūyabindu*, 196-7, 229.  
*Nyūyakandalī*, 201.  
*Nyūyakakaṇṭhā*, 209, 28  
*Nyūyakumudacandrodaya*, 231.  
*Nyūyakusumāñjali*, 197.  
*Nyūyalilāvati*, 201.  
*Nyūyamañjarī*, 197.  
*Nyūyāmṛta*, 218.  
*Nyūyaparīkṣita*, 197.  
*Nyūyapraveśa*, 72, 228, 232.  
*Nyūyarakṣamaṇa*, 218.  
*Nyūyaratnākara*, 210.  
*Nyūyasūtra*, 197.  
*Nyūyasucīnibandha*, 197.  
*Nyūyasudhā*, 210.  
*Nyūyasūtra*, 135, 195-6, 196n,  
 200, 208.  
*Nyūyasūtravṛtti*, 199.  
*Nyūyasūtroddhāra*, 197.  
*Nyūyatātparyāṭikā*, 196.  
*Nyūyavatāra*, 230.  
*Nyūyavivineśaya*, 231.  
*Nyūyavivṛttika*, 196-7.  
*Nyūyavivṛttikatātparyapari-*  
*śuddhi*, 197.  
 Oldenberg, H., 93, 146, 36n, 61n.  
*Padamañjarī*, 152.  
*Padārṇkadūta*, 121n.  
*Padārthadharmasamgraha*, 200.  
*Padārthakhaṇḍana*, 198.  
*Padmanābha*, 157.  
*Padmapāda*, 216.  
*Padmapurāṇa*, court-epic, 85.  
*Padmapurāṇa*, 42, 108.  
*Padyacūṭamaṇa*, 85.  
*Paksadharamiśra*, 198.  
*Pālakūpya*, 192.  
*Pañcudāsī*, 217.  
*Pañcinana Tarkaratna*, 117, 237.  
*Pañcasāyaka*, 182.  
*Pañcasidhāntikā*, 187-8.  
*Pañcasākhya*, 203.  
*Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*, 227.  
*Pañcarātra*, 103.  
*Pañcatānta*, 21, 143.  
*Pāṇḍavacarita*, 87.

- Pāṇḍavapurāṇa*, 87.  
 Pāṇini, 2, 17, 19, 20-1, 34, 57,  
 84, 99, 149, 149n, 150, 215n.  
 Paolino, F., i.  
*Paramalaghumañjūśā*, 154n.  
*Paramārtha*, 203n.  
*Paramārthasaptati*, 71, 227.  
*Paramārthasūtra*, 46  
*Paramasaṃhitā*, 46.  
*Parāśara*, 43.  
*Parāśaramādhava*, 178.  
*Parāśarasmyti*, 178.  
*Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, 154  
*Paribhāṣāsūtras*, 155.  
*Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, 158.  
*Parīkṣāmukhasūtra*, 231.  
*Parimala*, 130.  
*Parimala*, 216.  
*pariṇāma*, 214.  
*Parīśiṣṭaparvan*, 86, 132  
*Pārśvābhyaṣaya*, 85.  
*Pārśvanāthacarita*, 87.  
*Pārthaparākrama*, 115.  
*Pārthasārathihiniśra*, 200-1  
*Pārvatīpariṇaya*, 116  
*Paśakakevalī*, 191n  
*Paśupati*, 178.  
*Pātālavijaya*, 84.  
*Patañjali*, grammarian, 16-7, 20,  
 34, 135, 148, 149n, 150-2,  
 207n  
*Patañjali, Yogasūtra*, 205, 207n.  
*Pāṭhaka*, 155.  
*Pathetic*, 110.  
*Patrāparīkṣā*, 231  
*Paṇḍarāsaṃhitā*, 46  
*Pavanadūtā*, 125.  
 Peterson, P., 78n-79n  
 Phuyau-king, 58  
*Piṅgala*, 171.  
 Pischel, R. 51, 89n, 91, 92n, 93,  
 105n, 108, 125, iii.  
*Piṭṛdayitā*, 178.  
*Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, 133.  
*Prabandhakośa*, 133.  
*Prabhacandra*, 132, 231.  
*Prabhākara*, 209, 212.  
*Prabhūcakacarita*, 132.  
*Prabodhacandrodaya*, 113, 233.  
*Prabuddharauhiṇya*, 115.  
*Pradīpa*, 152, 154.  
*Pradyumnasūri*, 132.  
*Prahasana*, 97, 109, 114-7  
*Prahlādanādeva*, 115  
*Prajñādaṇḍa*, 71.  
*Prajñāparamitas*, 70, 224.  
*Prakaraṇa*, 97, 104, 106, 110,  
 115-6.  
*Prakaraṇapañcīkā*, 209.  
*Prakaraṇikā*, 98  
*Prakaśananda*, 218  
*Prakaśatman*, 216.  
*Prakīrṇakavṇā*, 81.  
*Prakṛta-paiṅgala*, 171.  
*Prakṛtyakamudī*, 153.  
*Pranayamamānsa*, 232  
*Pranayānirṇaya*, 231.  
*Pranayāparīkṣā*, 231.  
*Pranayāpaveśa*, 228.  
*Pranayasamuccaya*, 72, 228.  
*Prameyakaṃalamārtanḍa*, 231  
*Prameyaratnavalī*, 222.  
*Pranatosiṇī*, 47  
*Prapañcasara*, 47.  
*Prasāda*, 153.  
*Prasannakavṇā*, 81.  
*Prasannapada*, 225.  
*Prasannaraghava*, 115  
*Prasthāna*, 89.  
*Prataparudrayasobhāṣaya*, 164.  
*Pratiharendurāja*, 162n.  
*Pratijñāyāugandharīyaṇa*, 109.  
*Pratimū*, 102.  
*pratimukha*, 95.



- Pratināyaka, 89.  
*Pratītyasamutpādaḥṛdaya*, 70, 225, 228.  
 Pratyabhijñā, 46.  
*Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*, 46.  
*Pratyabhijñākārikā*, 46.  
*Pratyabhijñāvimarśinī*, 46.  
*Pratyaktattvapradīpikā*, 217.  
*Pravāḥamanoranmā*, 153, 159.  
*Pravāḥamanoramūkucamardinī*, 59.  
 Pravarasena, 137.  
*Prāyaścittavivaraṇa*, 177.  
 Preṅkhaṇaka, 98.  
*Priyadarśikū*, 109.  
 Priyamivada, 128.  
 Pṛthuyāśas, 190.  
 Pṛthvidhara, 156.  
*Pṛthvīrājaviṇaya*, 132.  
 Puṇyaraṇa, 157.  
 Purāṇa Kāśyapa, 234.  
*Pūrvamegha*, 121.  
*Pūrvamīmāṃsūsūtra*, 208, 214.  
*Pūrvapīṭhikā*, 138.  
*Puruṣaparīkṣā*, 145.  
*Puruṣārthasiddhyupāya*, 232.  
 Puruṣottama, 174.  
 Puruṣottamadeva, 158.  
 Puṣpadanta, 127.  
 Puṣpamitra, Puṣyamitra, 73, 78n, 150.  
 Quietistic, 95, 113.  
 Rabindranath, 121.  
 Radhakrishnan, S., 5, 196n, 210, 216.  
*Rāgavibodha*, 193.  
*Rāghavanaiśadhīya*, 87.  
 Rāghavananda, 177.  
*Rāghavapīṇḍavīya*, 85.  
*Rāghavapīṇḍavīyanaiśadhīya*, 87.  
 Rāghunandana, 43n, 178.  
 Rāghunātha, 198.  
 Rāghunātha Śiromaṇi, 198.  
*Rāghuvaiṃśa*, 78n, 80.  
*Rāvatamadanikū*, 98.  
*Rājamarṭaṇḍa*, 206, 207n.  
 Rājaśekhara, 82, 84-5, 92, 98, 100, 112-3.  
 Rājaśekhara, 14th century, 133, 165.  
 Rājayoga, 207.  
*Rājataranigūṇī*, 106, 110, 129, 131, 137.  
*Rajendrakarṇapūra*, 132.  
 Rāmabhedramuni, 115.  
 Rāmadiṣṭa, 116-7.  
 Rāmacandra, *Kaumudimītrānanda*, 115.  
 Rāmacandra, *Nīrbhayabhīma-vyūyoga*, 115.  
 Rāmacandra, *Bhaktiśataka*, 128.  
 Rāmacandra, *Prakṛyūkaumudī*, 153.  
*Rāmācarita*, 86.  
 Rāmācārya, 219.  
 Rāmākṣṇa, 218.  
 Rāmākṣṇabhāṭṭa, 211.  
*Rāmālarahasya*, 191n.  
 Rāmānuja, 38, 213n, 219, 220, 235.  
*Rāmāpīlacarita*, 131.  
 Rāma Tarkavāgīśa, 157.  
 Rāmātīrtha, 219.  
*Rāmāyana*, 21, 23-6, 27n, 28, 28n, 29, 30-1, 35-7, 43, 82, 85, 99, 101-2, 110, 113, 115, ii.  
*Rāmāyanaacampū*, 147.  
*Rāmāyanaamañjarī*, 86.  
 Rapson, E. J., 61n.  
 Rasa, 75, 161-4, 166-9.  
*Rasagaṅgādhara*, 170.

Rāsaka. 98.  
*Rasamañjarī*, 168.  
*Rasaratnākara*, 185  
*Rasatarāṅgī*, 168  
*Rasavatī*, 157.  
*Rasikāñjana*, 87.  
*Rāṣṭrapāla*, 70.  
*Ratīmañjarī*, 183.  
*Ratīrahasya*, 182.  
*Ratīśūstra*, 183  
*Ratnākara*, 85.  
*Ratnakāraṇḍasrūvakācūra*, 231.  
*Ratnaparikṣī*, 193.  
*Ratnakūṭa*, 70  
*Ratnāvadānamālā*, 74  
*Ratnaprabhā*, 218.  
*Ratnāvalī*, 97, 109, 109n, 114  
*raudra*, 75n  
*Rāvaṇārjunīya*, 85  
*Rāvaṇavadha*, 81, 82  
*Raviṣeṇa*, 85.  
 Raychaudhuri, H , 62n.  
*Rgveda*, 29, 88, 92, 107, 114,  
 187, ii.  
*Rjuvimalā*, 209.  
*R̥tusañhāra*, 122. i.  
 Ridgeway, 91.  
 Rīti, 88. 161-3.  
 Roer, E., iv.  
 Rosen, F., iii  
 Roth, R., iii.  
 Roy, S., 78n  
 Rozer, A., i.  
 Rucaka, 167.  
 Ruckert, F., iii.  
 Rudradāman, 48  
 Rudraṭa, 162  
 Rudrabhaṭṭa, 144.  
*Rudrayāmala*, 46.  
*Rukmīñāharaṇa*, 97, 115.  
 Rūpagosvāmin, 58, 116, 121n,  
 169, 221.

Rūpaka. 97.  
 Ruyyaka, 86. 167.  
*Śābarabhāṣya*, 208-9.  
*Śābaraśvāmin*, 135, 203. 208-9.  
*Śābdakalpadrūma*, 43n, 174.  
*Śābdakaustubha*, 153.  
*Śābdānuśāsana*, Hemacandra.  
 156.  
*Śābdānuśāsana, Śakaṭāyana*, 155  
*Śābdānuśāsanabhadrī*, 156.  
*Śābdaratna*, 159.  
*Śābdānupracandrikā*, 155.  
*Śābdasaktiprakāśikā*, 191.  
 Sadananda, 218.  
 Sadāśiva, 192.  
*Saddharmapūṣṭārīka*, 69.  
*Saḍdarśanasamuccaya*, 232.  
*Sādhanī*, 206.  
*Sādūktīkarṇāmṛta*, 127.  
 Sāgaranandin, 168.  
*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 97, 116, 160.  
 Sakalakīrti, 87, 232.  
 Śakaṭāyana, 149, 155.  
*śakti*, 164.  
*Śākuntala*, 78n, 79n, 90, 107-8. i.  
 Śālihotra. 192.  
 Śālikanātha, 209.  
*Samādhi*, 206.  
*Samudhīraja*, 70.  
 Samantabhadra, 230-1.  
*Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*, 193.  
 Samavakāra, 97, 103. 115  
*Sāmaveda*, 88.  
*Samayamātṛka*, 127.  
 Śāmbha, 43.  
 Śāmbhū, 127, 132.

- Saṁhitā, 44-6.  
*Saṁjñātāntra*, 191.  
*Saṁkṣepaśūriraka*, 217.  
*Saṁkṣiptasāra*, 157.  
 Saṁlāpaka, 98.  
*Sammattarkasūtra*, 230.  
*Saṁskārapaddhati*, 177.  
 Sanskrit Grammar, ii.  
*Samudramanthana*, 97, 115  
*Samudratilaka*, 191n  
 Saṁvāda hymn, 92-3, 107.  
*Samyaktvamuktivāli*, 145  
*Sanatkumāra*, 43.  
*Sandarbhāṣa*, 221.  
*sandhi*, 76, 95  
 Sandhyākaranandin, 131.  
*Saṁgītadarpaṇa*, 193.  
*Saṁgītamakāṇḍa*, 193  
*Saṁgītaratnākara*, 193.  
*Saṁgītasūdarśana*, 195.  
 Saṁjaya, 234.  
*Śaṅkaracetovilāsacampū*, 147.  
 Śaṅkara, 38, 126-7, 135, 210, 213n, 214-5, 217-9, 221, 237.  
 Śaṅkara, *Upaskāra*, 201.  
 Śaṅkhaadhara Kavirāja, 115.  
 Śaṅkha, 41, 71.  
*Śaṅkhyakārikā*, 203-4.  
*Śaṅkhyapravacanabhāṣya*, 204.  
*Śaṅkhyapravacanasūtra*, 204  
*Śaṅkhyasūtra*, 204  
*Śaṅkhyasūtravṛtti*, 204.  
*Śaṅkhyatattvakaumudī*, 204.  
*Śaṅkhyayanaśrautasūtra*, 33.  
*Śaṁmukhakalpa*, 193.  
*śānta*, 75n.  
 Śāntarakṣita, 229.  
 Śāntideva, 72n, 225.  
 Śāntiparvan, 233.  
 Śāntiśataka, 128.  
*Saptapadārthi*, 201.  
*Śatapathaśatīkanāmastotra*, 67.  
*Saptaśatī*, 42.  
*Śāradūtanaya*, 167.  
*Śāradūtilaka*, 47.  
*arāṇadeva*, 158  
*Sārasvataprakriyā*, 156-57.  
*Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharāṇa*, 166.  
*sarga*, 76.  
*Śārīputraprakaraṇa*, 66, 100  
*Śārīrakabhāṣya*, 215-16.  
*Śarmasṭhītyayūti*, 97.  
 Śārṅgadatta, 192  
 Śārṅgadeva, 193.  
 Śārṅgadhara, 128.  
*Śārṅgadharaṇapaddhati*, 128.  
*Sarvadarśanaśaṁgraha*, 204, 234, iv.  
 Sarvañāmitra, 126.  
 Sarvañātmanamuni, 217.  
 Sarvānanda, 133, 173.  
*Sarvasaṁvādinī*, 222.  
*Sarvasiddhantaśaṁgraha*, 237.  
 Sarvāstivādin, 52, 56-7, 67, 71.  
 Sarvavarman, 156.  
*Saśṭhītantra*, 203.  
*Śāstradarpaṇa*, 216.  
*Śāstradīpikā*, 211  
 Śāstrin, Haraprasad, 62, 65, 79n, 91.  
 Śāstrin, Pashupatinath, 212n.  
 Śāstrin, T. Ganapati, 100.  
*Śāśvata*, 174.  
*Śatadīpaṇī*, 220.  
*Śataka*, 122.  
*Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, 187, iii.

- Śatānanda, 86, 189  
*Śatasūhasīk aprajñāpāramitā*, 224  
 Sātavāhana, 120  
 Satkāryavāda, 404  
*Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, 86.  
 Saṭṭaka, 98, 113  
*Sattasaī*, 120, 127  
*Sāttvatasamhitā*, 46  
 Sauddhodanī, 169  
*Saugandhikāhaṇa*, 116  
 Saumilla, 105.  
*Saundarananda*, 65, 77  
*Saundaryalaharī*, 126.  
 Śaurasenī, 91  
 Sautrāntika, 223-4, 227  
 Sūyāṇa, 158, in  
 Schiller, 122, in  
 Schlegel, F 27n, in  
 Schlegel, A. W. von, in.  
 Schopenhauer, iii.  
 Schroeder, L von, 93, 122n. 125  
 Senaka, 149  
 Senart, F., 51, iv  
 Śeṣakṛṣṇa, 116.  
*Seśvaramimāṃsa*, 220.  
*Setubandha*, 137.  
*Sevyasevakopadeśa*, 127  
 Shadow-Sītā, 92  
 Siddha, 145.  
*Siddhāntakaumudī*, 153-54.  
*Siddhāntaleśasaṅgraha*, 218  
*Siddhāntamuktāvalī*, 218.  
*Siddhāntapañcāśikā*, 232.  
*Siddhāntaśiromaṇi*, 189.  
 Siddhasena Divākara, 126, 230.  
*Śikhāmaṇi*, 218.  
*Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 225.  
 Śilabhadra, 228-29.  
 Śilabhaṭṭārikā, 128  
 Śilhaṇa, 198  
 Śilpaka, 98.  
 Śilparatna, 193,  
*Śiṃhāsanaadvātrīṃśika*, 144.  
 Śiradeva, 158  
 Sīri Puṣṭumayi, 49  
*Śīśupālaradha*, 83.  
*Śīśuadhīrddhitānta*, 189.  
 Sitabeṅga, 89  
 Śivadāsa, 144, 145  
 Śivadatta, 106  
*Śivadharmā*, 43  
 Śivaditya, 201  
*Śivadṛṣṭi*, 46.  
*Śivapurāṇa*, 42  
*Śivārkanandīpika*, 235  
 Śivasvamin, 85  
 Skandagupta, 77  
*Skandapurāṇa*, 38, 42, 108  
*Ślokasaṅgraha*, 142.  
*Śloka-vṛttika*, 210  
 Smith, V. A., 5, 6, 41, 53, 59, 60n. 62n, iv.  
*Smṛtikalpataru*, 177  
*Smṛtiratnākara*, 178.  
 Soddhala, 147.  
 Somadeva, 142, 146, 155, 181.  
 Somānanda, 46.  
 Somapātha, 193, 211.  
 Somaprabha, 128.  
 Somesvarabhadda, 210.  
 Someśvaradatta, 132.  
*Sphoṭasiddhi*, 211n.  
 Sphoṭāyana, 149.  
*Sragdhanāstotra*, 126.  
*Śrāutasūtras*, 175.  
*Śrībhāṣya*, 219, 220.

- Śrīcaitanya, 198.  
 Śrīdhara, 127, 167, 201.  
 Śrīdharasena, 82.  
 Śrīdharasvāmin, 235.  
 Śrīgadita, 98.  
 Śrīharṣa, 83, 98, 217, 228.  
 Śrīhastamuktāvalī, 194.  
 Śrīkaṇṭha, 235.  
 Śrīkaṇṭhabhūṣya, 235.  
 Śrīkaṇṭhacarita, 86.  
 Śrīkarabhūṣya, 235.  
 Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya, 221.  
 Śrīkumāra, 193.  
 Śrīnivāsacārya, 220.  
 Śrīpati Paṇḍita, 235.  
 Śrīsaṅkuka, 163.  
 Śrīvara, 128, 144.  
 Śrīvatsa, 201.  
 śṛṅgūra, 75n.  
 Śṛṅgūraprakāśa, 166.  
 Śṛṅgūraśataka, 122.  
 Śṛṅgūratilaka, 98, 125.  
 Śṛṅgūravavṛgyatarāṅgī, 128.  
 Śrutabodha, 171.  
 Śrutaprakāśikā, 219.  
 Śrutasāgara, 233.  
 Stein, M., iv.  
 Sthāpaka, 92.  
 Sthiramati, 72, 288.  
 St. Petersburg Dictionary, iii.  
 Strauss, O., iv, iii.  
 Suali, 169n.  
 Subandhu, 34, 39, 46, 138.  
 Subhacandra, 87, 231.  
 Subhāṣitamuktāvalī, 128.  
 Subhāṣitaratnasandloha, 127.  
 Subhāṣitāvalī, 128.  
 Subodhinī, 235.  
 Sucaritamīśra, 210.  
 Subhaṭa, 116.  
 Sudarśana, 193, 220.  
 Śuddhādvaita, 236.  
 Śuddhādvaitavāda, 231.  
 Śūdraka, 105, 105n, 10.  
 Suhrillekha, 71n.  
 Śukasaptatī, 144.  
 Sukhāvativyūha, 69.  
 Śukranīti, 181.  
 Sukṛtasaṅkīrtana, 133.  
 Śūlapāṇi 178.  
 Śuṅgas, 107, 176.  
 Śūnya, 196n.  
 Śūnyatā, 225.  
 Śūnyatūsaptatī, 70, 225.  
 Supadma, 157.  
 Supadmapañjikā, 157.  
 Suparṇādhyaṃya, 93n.  
 Suprabhātastotra, 126.  
 Suatotsava, 132.  
 Sureśvara, 211, 217.  
 Sūryaśataka, 123, 123n.  
 Sūrya-upapurīṣa, 43.  
 Suśruta, 135, 184-5.  
 Sūtradhāra, 92.  
 Sūtrālaṅkāra, 65, 68.  
 Suvarṇaprabhāsa, 70.  
 Suvṛttatilaka, 172.  
 Svacchanda, 46.  
 Svāhāsudhākanācampū, 147.  
 Svapnadaśānana, 114.  
 Svapnavāsavadattā, 103-4.  
 Svāyambhuva, 46.

- Śvetāmvara, 229-30, 232.  
*Tattvīriyāraṇyaka*, 187.  
*Tattvīriyasamhitā*, 148n, 187  
*Tattvīriyopanisadbhāṣya-vārttika*, 217.  
*Tājikā*, 191.  
 Takakusu, 71, 203n.  
 Tāmil Gāthās, 219  
 Tāṇḍava, 88.  
*Tautūtitamatatūlaka*, 177, 210.  
 Tantra, 44-5, 190  
*Tantiāloka*, 46  
*Tantrākhyāyikā*, 143.  
*Tantrarāja*, 47  
*Tantrasāra*, 46-7, 198  
*Tantravārttika*, 260  
*Tāpasavatsarāṇacarita*, 114  
*Tārālā*, 168.  
 Tāranātha, 67  
 Tāranātha, *Vacaspatya*, 174  
*Taraṅgiṇī*, 219.  
*Tarkabhāṣā*, 201  
*Tarkāmṛta*, 201  
*Tarkakaumudī*, 201  
*Tarkasaṅgraha*, 201  
*Tarkikarakṣā*, 201.  
*Tattvabodhinī*, 153  
*Tattvacintāmaṇi*, 198.  
*Tattvacintāmaṇivyākhyā*, 198.  
*Tattvadīpikā*, 233.  
*Tattvapīkāśikā*, 220  
*Tattvārthadhigamasūtra*, 220-21  
*Tattvārthadīpikā*, 252.  
*Tattvārthadīpikā*, 233  
*Tattvārtharājavārttika*, 231.  
*Tattvārthasāra*, 232  
*Tattvārthasālokavārttika*, 231.  
*Tattvasaṅgraha*, 229.  
*Tattvasaṅgrahapañcikā*, 229  
*Tattvaṭīkā*, 220.  
*Tattvavaiśarādī*, 206.  
*Tattvavyākhyā*, 198.  
 Taylor, I., 8.  
 Thera, 54.  
 Thibaut, G., iv.  
 Thomas, F. W., 60n, 61n, 68n, iv  
*Tilakamañjarī*, 147.  
*Tiṇantakāṇḍa*, 81.  
*Tipitaka*, 3, 28, 34, 67, 67n, 222.  
 Tisāta, 186.  
*Tithitattva*, 179  
*Trikayāśeṣa*, 174.  
*Trīmśika*, 227-28  
*Tripurādhara*, 97, 115  
*Trisastīśalakapuruṣacarita*, 86.  
*Trīsatī*, 189  
 Trivikramabhāṭṭa, 146.  
 Troṭaka, 98, 107.  
 Tscherbatsky, T iv  
 Tueci, G., iv.  
*Tupṭikā*, 210.  
*Ucchuṣṣmabhairava*, 46.  
*Uddiṭṭarāghava*, 114.  
*Udanaragga*, 224.  
 Udayana, 197-98, 201  
*Udayasundarīkatha*, 147.  
 Udbhaṭa, 161, 162, 162n, 167.  
 Uddandīn, 116.  
 Uddyota, 154.  
 Uddyotakara, 138, 196-97, 200.  
*Udvahatattva*, 178.  
*Ujjvalanīlamani*, 169.  
 Ullāpya, 98.  
 Ulūka, 203.  
 Umāsvāmin, 230.  
 Umāsvatī, 230.  
 Umbeka, 210.  
*Uṇādisūtras*, 155.  
*Unmattarāghava*, 117.  
*Upakramaparākrama*, 211.

- Upamātibhavaprapaṣcā-kathā*, 145.  
*Upamātibhavaprapaṣcā-kathā-sūroddhāra*. 232.  
 Upaniṣad, 135.  
 Uparūpaka, 97.  
*Upaskāra*, 201.  
*Upavarṣa*, 208, 215n.  
*Urubhaṅga*. 102.  
*Uśanas-upapurāṇa*, 180.  
 Utpala, 46.  
*utsāha*, 112.  
 Utsṛṣṭikāṅka, 97.  
*Uttarapurāṇa*, 85.  
*Uttararāmacarita*, 90, 92, 111.  
*Vācaspatī*, 179, 197, 204, 206, 209, 211, 213n. 216, 231.  
*Vācaspatya*, 174.  
 Vādirāja, 86.  
 Vāgbhaṭa, epic-poet, 87.  
 Vāgbhaṭa, rhetorician, 168.  
 Vāgbhaṭa, rhetorician, 168.  
 Vāgbhaṭa, medical authority 185.  
*Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra*, 168.  
 Vaibhāṣika, 223-4, 227.  
 Vaidarbha. 49, 110, 138  
*Vaidyaśivana*, 186.  
*Vaijayanī*, 174.  
*Vaikhāṇasadharmasūtra*. 175.  
*Vaipulyasūtra*. 56-7.  
*Vairāgyaśataka*. 123.  
*Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, 200, 201.  
*Vaiṣṇavadharmasūtra*, 175  
*Vaiṣṇavatoṣṇī*, 221,  
*Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa*, 159.  
*Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra*, 159.  
*Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamañjūṣā*, 154.  
*Vaiyāsikanyūyamālā*, 218.  
 Vajradatta, 123n.  
*Vajrasūci*, 67.  
 Vākpati, 110, 130.  
 Vakrokti, 166.  
*Vakroktijīvita*, 166.  
*Vākyapadīya*, 123n, 151, 155.  
 Valabhi, 82.  
*Vālvadha*, 98.  
 Vallabha, *Nyāyalīlāvatī*, 201.  
 Vallabha, *Suddhādvaita*, 213n, 220, 236.  
 Vallee Poussin, 57. iv.  
 Vālmiki, 23, 26, 28, 36, 81.  
 Vāmana, rhetorician, 82, 105n, 111, 123, 164.  
 Vāmana, grammarian, 151-2.  
*Vāmana-puīṇa*, 42.  
 Vāmana Bhaṭṭa Bāṇa, 116.  
*Vandāruvṛtti*, 232.  
 Varadarāja, grammarian, 154  
 Varadarāja, *Tārkikarakṣā*. 201.  
 Varāhamihira, 187, 190.  
*Varāha-purāṇa*, 42.  
*Vāraruca-kūvya*, 84.  
 Vararuci, 171.  
 Vardhamāna, Kātantra-school, 156  
 Vardhamāna. *Gaṇaratnamahodadhī*, 158.  
 Vardhamāna. *Yogamañjarī*, 192.  
 Vardhamāna, Nāyāyika, 198.  
 Vardhamāna, Jina, 229.  
*Varivasyārahasya*, 47.  
 Varṣa, 215n.  
 Vārsagaṇya, 203, 203n.  
*Varṣatantra*, 191.  
*Vārttikābharāṇa*, 210  
 Vārttikakāra, 150.  
 Vārttikas, 150, 155.  
*Varuṇa-upapurāṇa*, 43.  
*Vāsavadattā*, 138-9.  
 Vaśiṣṭha. 1. 175 .  
*vastu*, 75.  
*Vāstuvidyā*, 192.

- Vasubandhu Asaṅga, 71, 203n,  
 224, 227-8.  
 Vāsudeva, *Bālaṃanoramā*, 153.  
 Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma, 198.  
 Vasumitra, 59, 223.  
 Vatsarāja, 97, 115.  
 Vātsyāyana, *Kāmasūtra*, 21, 135,  
 182.  
 Vātsyāyana, philosopher, 195-6,  
 200.  
*Vātsyāyanabhāṣya*, 200.  
*Vāyupurāṇa*, 38, 41.  
*Vāyu-upapurāṇa*, 43.  
 Vedāntadeśika, 121n.  
*Vedāntakaustubha*, 220.  
*Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, 218.  
*Vedāntapūrṇātasaaurabha*, 220.  
*Vedāntasāra*, 218.  
*Vedāntasūtra*, 212, 218.  
 Vedas, 44.  
 Vedic Concordance, iii.  
 Vedic Grammar, iii.  
 Vedic Index, iii.  
 Vedic Mythology, iii.  
 Vedic Studies, iii.  
 Venis, A., iv.  
*Veṇīśaṅkulāra*, 111-2  
 Veṅkaṭadikṣita, 210  
 Veṅkaṭanātha Vedānta-  
 deśika, 220.  
*Veṭilapañcaviṃśati*, 144  
*Vibhāṣā*, 223.  
*Vibhramaviveka*, 211.  
*Vibhūti*, 206.  
*Vicitrakarṇikāvadāna*, 74.  
*Vidagdhamādhava*, 74.  
*Viddhaśālabhaṅṅikā*, 113.  
*Vidhirasāyana*, 211.  
*Vidhiviveka*, 211.  
 Vidūṣaka, 89.  
 Vidyābhāṣaṇa, S. C. 195n,  
 Vidyācakravartin, 167.  
 Vidyādhara, 168.  
*Vidyāmādhaviya*, 190-91.  
 Vidyānanda, 231.  
 Vidyānātha, 169.  
 Vidyāpati, 133, 145, 178, 181.  
 Vidyāraṇya, 216-7.  
*Vidyāsundara*, 124.  
*Vigrahavyāvartanī*, 70, 225.  
 Vijjakā, 128.  
*Vijñāna*, 196n, 226.  
*Vijñānabhairava*, 46.  
 Vijñānabhikṣu, 204, 206, 237.  
*Vijñānāmṛtabhāṣya*, 237.  
 Vijñāneśvara, 177.  
*Vijñāptimūtratāsiddhi*, 72, 227.  
 Vikāṇatambā, 128.  
 Vikramāditya, Candragupta, 138,  
 Vikramāditya, Patron of 'Nine  
 gems,' 144, 173.  
 Vikramāditya, authority on  
 archery, 192.  
*Vikramāṅgikudevacarita*, 131.  
*Vikramorvaśīya*, 98, 107.  
*Vikrāntakaurava*, 116.  
*Vilāsavatī*, 98.  
 Vilāsikā, 98.  
*vinaiśa*, 95.  
*Vinśatikā*, 227-8.  
 Vinuktatman, 217.  
*Vinayapīṭaka*, 4, 222.  
 Vindhyavāsin, 203n.  
*Vipralambhaśṛṅgāra*, 95.  
*vira*, 75n.  
*Viramitrodaya*, 179.  
 Viśākhadatta, 111.  
 Viśāladeva Vighraharāja, 115.  
 Viśālākṣa, 180.  
*viśaya*, 216.  
 Viśiṣṭādvaita, 219.  
 Viśiṣṭaśivādvaita, 235.  
*Viṣṇudharmottara*, 193-4.  
 Viṣṇugupta, 180.



- Viṣṇupurāṇa*, 41-2, 134,  
 233, 236.  
*Viṣṇuśarman*, 143.  
*Viṣṇusvāmin*, 236.  
*Viśvakarmaparakāśa*, 193.  
*Viśvanātha*, rhetorician, 97, 116.  
 167, 169.  
*Viśvanātha*, philosopher, 199, 201.  
*Viśvaparakāśa*, 174.  
*Viśvarūpa*, 211.  
*Viśveśvara*, 178.  
*Vītarāgastotra*, 127.  
*Vithi*, 97.  
*Viṭṭhalācārya*, 153.  
*Vivādacintāmaṇi*, 179.  
*Vivādaratnākara*, 178.  
*Vivādarṇavasetu*, i.  
*Vivaraṇa*, 216.  
*Vivaraṇaprameyasajṅgraha*, 216.  
*Vivaraṇa school*, 216.  
*vivarta*, 214.  
*Vivṛti*, 202.  
*Void*, 225.  
*Vopadeva*, 157-8.  
*Vratūvadānamālā*, 74.  
*Vṛddhagargasaṁhitā*, 190.  
*Vṛddhavāsīṣṭhasaṁhitā*, 191.  
*Vṛndāvanastuti*, 127.  
*Vṛttaratnākara*, Kēdāra, 172.  
*Vṛttaratnākara*, Nārāyaṇa, 172.  
*Vṛtti*, Kūśikā 152.  
*Vṛtti*, Durgasiṁha, 156.  
*Vṛtti*, quoted by Śabara, 208.  
*Vṛttikāra*, 208, 215.  
*Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya*, 148, 151.  
*Vyākhyāyukti*, 227.  
*Vyaktiviveka*, 166.  
*vyañjanā*, 164.  
*Vyāptipañcaka*, 199.  
*Vyāsa*, 38, 206, 208, 219n.  
*Vyāsabhāṣya*, 206.  
*Vyāsarāja*, 218.  
*Vyāsarāma*, 219.  
*Vyāsātīrtha*, 218,  
*Vyavahāracintāmaṇi*, 179.  
*Vyāyoga*, 97, 102, 115-6.  
*Vyomaśekhara*, 201.  
*Vyomaśivācārya*, 201.  
*Vyomavatī*, 201.  
*Weber*, A. A., 8, 28, 28n, 29,  
 89n, 109n, 149, 187.  
*Whitney*, W. D., iii.  
*Wilkins*, C., i.  
*Wilson*, H. H., iii.  
*Winternitz*, M., 26-8, 31, 36,  
 42, 36n, 65n, 66n, 109n, iv.  
*Windisch*, E., 89.  
*Wogihara*, 71.  
*Wonderful*, 110.  
*Yādava*, 174.  
*Yādavodaya*, 98.  
*Yājñavalkya*, 178.  
*Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, 177-78.  
*Yajurveda*, 33, 88.  
*Yamakas*, 122.  
*Yāmunācārya*, 219.  
*Yaśaḥpāla*, 116.  
*Yaśaścandra*, 115.  
*Yaśastīlaka*, 147, 181.  
*Yāska*, 19, 20, 173.  
*Yaśodhara*, 182.  
*Yaśodharacarita*, 86.  
*Yaśodharacarita*, 86.  
*Yaśomitra*, 72n, 224, 227.  
*Yaśovijaya*, 233.  
*Yātrā*, 125, 125n.  
*Yavanajāataka*, 190.  
*Yavanikā*, 89, 90.  
*Yoga*, 41, 154.  
*Yogabindu*, 232.  
*Yogācāra*, 71, 223, 225-7.  
*Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, 71, 226,  
 226n.

*Yogaḍṛṣṭīsamuccaya*, 232.

*Yogamañjarī*, 192.

*Yogasāra*, 127,

*Yogasārasaṁgraha*, 206.

*Yogaśāstra*, 127.

*Yogasūtra*, 205-6, 206n, 207n,  
208.

*Yogavārttika*, 206.

Yuan Chwang, 224, 229.

*Yuktidīpikā*, 204.

*Yuktikalpataru*, 181, 193.

*Yuktiśaṣṭikā*, 70, 225.

*Yuktisnehaprapūraṇī*, 211

*Yuktyanuśāsana*, 231.

---



